

School of Theology at Claremont



1001 1388012

# EVERYMAN

## A MORALITY PLAY



Theology Library  
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY  
AT CLAREMONT  
California















# EVERYMAN

*BY MONTROSE J. MOSES*

CHILDREN'S BOOKS AND READING

HENRIK IBSEN THE MAN AND HIS PLAYS

FAMOUS ACTOR FAMILIES IN AMERICA

LITERATURE OF THE SOUTH In preparation

*EDITED BY MR. MOSES*

EVERYMAN A Morality Play





EVERYMAN.

2011  
5  
1958

# EVERYMAN

## *A Morality Play*

*Edited with an introduction  
notes and bibliography by*

MONTROSE J. MOSES

*With illustrations*



NEW YORK  
MITCHELL KENNERLEY

*Copyright 1908 by  
Mitchell Kennerley*

*To My Mother*





## LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

	PAGE
EVERYMAN . . . . .	<i>Frontispiece</i>
Character Group . . . . .	83
EVERYMAN. Commaunded I Am to Go a Journaye . . . . .	95
KNOWLEGE. Everyman, I Wyll Go with The and Be Thy Gyde . . . . .	109
CONFESSYON. Here Shall You Receyve That Scourge of Me . . . . .	111
EVERYMAN. O Eternal God, O Hevenly Fyfigure	112
EVERYMAN. I Go before, There I Wolde Be: God Be Our Gyde . . . . .	122
GOOD DEDES. Nay, Everyman, I Wyll Byde with The . . . . .	126



## THE PREDECESSORS OF EVERYMAN

A COMPREHENSIVE appreciation of *Everyman* involves some knowledge of the dramatic development of which it is a part. The Morality was no sudden form of play, sprung into existence; it was based upon an historic tradition of rare interest, involving centuries of social progress. Changes in civilization, in thought, in form, are not sharply defined, but grade, one into the

THE other, and follow evolutionary laws. The CHURCH. student of medieval literature, of the literature of any epoch, will find reasons for the existence of a particular *genre* only in so far as he understands the social forces that called it forth.

In the early history of the drama this fact is strikingly illustrated, since the drama became an accessory of the Church, to satisfy a social want. Scholars are now well agreed that the sources of the modern drama are not to be found in the theatres of Greece and of Rome. Mention is made of a Greek play, dealing with the *Passion of Christ*, which was probably written in the IVth century by St. Gregory Názianzen, who died A. D. 390; one Latin comedy, constructed along the lines of Plautus; and six Latin comedies by Hroswitha, a nun of the Gandersheim convent, Saxony. But save for the fact that Greg-

ory drew his form from Euripides, and Hroswitha from Terence, there is little in spirit or in purpose to show any deeper influence from the classic drama. These plays were more on the order of the later Scholar pieces which rarely reached any other atmosphere than that of the monastery. It is to the Church that the modern drama owes its life, and in the Church that dramatic beginnings were nurtured.

Christianity, from the first, had some vital and conflicting forces with which to contend. On the one hand, there were paganism and Judaism, with their countless forms and customs; and on the other hand, a people, unthinking and ignorant, who were attracted toward the licentious amusements encouraged by paganism. Against this opposing tide, the Christian Church set an art which would help allay the restless ignorance of her converts. The congregations that listened to the Latin sermon did not understand Latin; the Bible was not an open book to them, since they could not read; it was natural therefore that form alone became symbolical of all that the priest was saying in a strange tongue.

To this new form the character of the service lent itself readily. In the IVth and Vth centuries, "the public worship of God assumed, if we may so speak, a dramatic, theatrical character which made it attractive and imposing to the mass of the people, who were as yet incapable of worshipping God in spirit and in truth." There was one underlying *motif* throughout the service, a deep religious strain which became more profound as each step in the life of

Christ was magnified through the desire to live again the life of the Crucified. Deeper and deeper this desire became, until the Divine Presence rose before His people in the transubstantiation of the bread and wine. An examination of the Mass will show this steady increase in intensity and in dramatic content. The questions of the priest and the responses of the congregation made definite divisions, not unlike character divisions. The service was necessarily dramatic since the Life was fraught with passion.

The term *dramatic*, applied to religious ceremony, is only a term after all, inclusive in its meaning, and used to impress a material fact. Man, himself made after the image of God, is to his fellow men flesh alone, through whose outward action the spirit becomes manifest. The religious impulse, awakened by the historic fact of the life of Christ, found expression through action, through physical, human means.

To the people, the early Church was the home of intellectual and moral training. It was well for them to hear the Biblical stories; it was better for them, the clergy argued, to see the stories represented. During the service, the attitudes assumed by the priests soon resulted in traditional poses similar to those portrayed in figures on the walls of the church, and by such tableau effects, the soil for the drama was prepared. We read in the *Ordinary of the Mass*: "Standing at the foot of the Altar, and having bowed to the Cross or the Altar, the Priest signs himself with the sign of the Cross from the forehead to the breast, and says in a distinct voice . . ." Again the instructions are: "First

extending, then joining his hands, the Priest says . . .” and so on throughout the service.

As the Church grew in power, her magnificence of outward pomp soon equalled that of the State. The temporal and spiritual dignitaries vied, one with the other, for the ascendancy. The vestments and ornaments of the Church assumed a symbolism in harmony with the symbolism of the service. The color generally used was white to typify salvation. Long coats richly embroidered, royal purple vestments to signify a majesty above the temporal power—everything tended to supplement some part of the service and to vivify the impression made upon the people.

It was the object of the early Christian Church to present to the congregation pictures which would illustrate the story of Christ's Life and Resurrection in such a way as to be understood by the people. They were simple folk, these converts of the early centuries; their great pleasure was in spectacles where action alone revealed the content. A simple nature is thus easily impressed, and display produces its usual amount of awe. Music, costume, action, three dramatic essentials, were adopted by the Church, and the service became more ornate, while its spirit remained unchanged. The people could not, as yet, distinguish between the outward and the inward interpretations. So the drama and religion co-operated to produce spiritual results. The one was a mere element of the other, until the two spirits—dramatic and religious—began to struggle for ascendancy and finally separated. The Church service sought expression through dramatic means. It was

not drama until the presence of extraneous dialogue made it so. Then was it that the strictly *liturgical* drama was evolved from and formed part of the Church service.

Some writers have given as a reason for the establishment of Easter before Christmas that the former had its counterpart in the Jewish Passover, while

Christmas had no corresponding festival in the calendar of the Old Testament faith. But certain it is that the religious impulse of the early

Church clung at first to what in historic time was nearest—the Crucifixion and the events attendant upon it. The first dramatic indications, therefore, are Easter plays, based upon what are commonly called *tropes*. These are defined by Léon Gautier (*Hist. Poés. Liturg. au Moyen Âge: Les Tropes*) as new and unauthorized passages intercalated among the words of the authentic and official text, expanding the original theme, and often exceeding the original text in length.<sup>1</sup> Probably the earliest *trope* extant was done in the Xth century by Tutilon, a monk of the Swiss monastery of St. Gall.\*

Space will not permit of more than a cursory examination of the Easter and Christmas plays. Tendencies must be looked at broadly, and from the mass of material those salient points must be considered that will best illustrate the development leading to *Everyman*.

The early Easter plays dealt with the incidents

\* Gayley, *Forefathers*, p. 16; Chambers, II., 15; Frere, W. H., *The Winchester Troper*.

centering about the Resurrection. The choir which, in the Church service, had split in twain for question and response, now further separated. Three personages, representing the Marys, proceed to the altar, as the symbolic grave of Christ, where they are met by two figures singing: "Whom seek ye in the sepulchre, O Christians" (*Quem quæritis in sepulchro, O christicolæ*)? The Marys answer: "Jesus of Nazareth, the crucified, O dwellers in heaven" (*Jesum Nazarenum crucifixum, O cælicolæ*)! And the reply follows: "He is not here; He is risen, as He has prophesied; go, proclaim that He has risen from the sepulchre" (*Non est hic, surrexit sicut prædixerat; ite, nuntiate quia surrexit de sepulchro*).

This primitive dialogue followed directly the third response given with the three lessons of the day. The special significance was that the clergy introduced extraneous material into the liturgy, accompanied by limited but definite action. This might increase by means of accretion and of incorporation with other dialogues, but in the germ it was the beginning of the drama *represented*.

A manuscript of the Xth century, coming from England, contains the following description: "While the third lesson is being recited," it reads, "four brethren [of the monastery] shall costume themselves, and one of these, who is to act a different part from the rest, shall enter, clothed in a long, white garment [alb], and, going to a position at the side of the tomb [altar], shall sit there quietly, holding a palm-branch in his hand. And when the third response has been completed, the other three shall



come up, dressed in long, flowing garments [copes], and bearing illuminated censers in their hands [thuribles]; and they shall go to the tomb slowly, as if looking for something. And now, when he who is sitting at the tomb observes these approach . . . he shall begin by singing softly, ‘*Whom seek ye?*’ ”

Finding the linens from Christ’s body, “they shall put down their censers, take up the linens and spread them out before the clergy, as if they wished to show that the Lord had risen, and was no longer wrapped in them. Having sung the antiphony, ‘*the Lord is risen from the tomb,*’ they shall place the linens upon the altar.”

This simple dialogue and action ultimately resulted in the numerous Passion plays of a later date; the writers seem to have been bound to the progress of the Biblical text, and though certain liberties were taken with the characters of Pilate, Herod, and the soldiers, the plays show, above all, the hand of the established ecclesiastic, rather than that of the embryo artist.

Hence the Christmas plays illustrate better than the Easter plays the development of the dramatic impulse, because they allowed the ecclesiastic a freer and more diversified treatment. In them are found for the first time an attempt at some plot and the introduction of something more human than the Resurrection scene would permit. The limitations of the Easter commemoration were due to the fact that its subject-matter touched the most sacred point in the Christian worship; for this reason, and also because the mystery of the Resurrection was impossible

to represent, there was not enough scope for dramatic action.

There is no doubt that the Christmas plays were based on *tropes* similar in form to those of the Easter plays. The question comes: "*Tell us, O shepherds, whom seek you in the manger?*" with the answer: "*The Saviour, who is Christ the Lord, a child wrapped in swaddling-clothes, according to the word of the angel.*" Then follows another speech, telling of the birth and recalling the prophecy of Isaiah.

Reaching back into the Old Testament, and looking upon all that occurred before the birth of Christ as a preparation for His coming, the material for the Christmas plays becomes centred about five main topics—the Magi, the Shepherds, Herod, Rachel, and the Massacre of the Innocents. These were depicted in many forms, first as single actions or dramas, and then they became incorporated bodily with other plays. A piece, *The Office of the Star*, given at Rouen, on the Epiphany, bears traces of two plays, *The Office of the Magi* (Limoges, MS. XIVth c.) and *The Office of the Shepherds* (Rouen, MS. XIVth c.), and shows the beginning of that *cyclic* development which is so well exemplified in the *Prophètes du Christ*. The part these plays occupied in the Church service is in many cases indicated at the beginnings of the manuscripts. The directions for one such piece state that on the sacred night of the birth of the Lord, after the *Te Deum* is sung, the play of *The Shepherds* shall begin, followed by the Mass; the directions for another that on the Epiphany, after the third response, three priests of high rank, represent-

ing the Magi, shall come to the altar, and that after the play has ended the service shall begin.

The manner in which these plays were presented depended at first on what accessories the Church had at hand. The star of Bethlehem was attached to a cord; the manger was built near the altar; and a statue represented the Christ. The angel who announced the birth was a child, suspended on a high platform. The costliness of their gowns and gold ornaments distinguished the Magi from the Shepherds.

The plays dealing with Herod made the material freer to handle, since the dramatist here felt himself dealing with an historical character rather than a religious figure. *The Lament of Rachel* likewise was treated purely from the human standpoint. In these plays there is evident a nearer approach to dramatic ideals, and a farther removal from the liturgical requirements. What is most striking to the student is the utter lack of any new view-point in the working over of old material by these writers. It never seemed necessary to them to give proportion to the progress of the plot; to exert much originality. What was done was done, and would serve the purpose of another writer, provided a continuous picture was shown, or an uninterrupted story told.

First came *The Shepherds*, and then *The Adoration of the Magi*. These were united by some new hand, with a visible line of joining, and placed further in a *Herod* drama, which in its turn led the way to *The Massacre of the Innocents*. A manuscript of the XIth century, entitled *Ordo Racheelis*, indicates

that the unknown author reached back to the *Shepherds*, the *Magi*, and the *Herod* dramas for material, and, in addition, introduced a scene, new to the liturgical drama, entitled *The Flight of the Holy Family*.

No account of these plays would be complete without mention of the *Prophètes du Christ* (Limoges, MS. XIth c.). It was the purpose of the early clergy, notably in the case of St. Augustine, to show that the Old Testament was but a preparation for the New. The play is what its literal name implies; among the prophets, Israel, Moses, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, David, Simeon, Elizabeth, John the Baptist, Virgil, and Aaron, each in turn, and in answer to doctrinal questions propounded, presumably by Augustine, tells of Christ's coming. The dialogue takes place in the middle of the nave of the church. In one or two cases the prophets argue with Jews who dispute with them. The play is based upon a sermon of St. Augustine, and many smaller dramas were likewise founded upon the same subject. A Rouen manuscript—more developed than the Limoges manuscript—bears the title, *Procession de l'Ane*, and shows a marked advance over any others in the introduction of the popular characters of Nebuchadnezzar, and Balaam and his ass.

The actors who presented these plays were clerics. One by one, the prophets, coming from the cloister, advanced, guided by two clerks of the second order. In the nave was placed the throne of Nebuchadnezzar, and near it a furnace, not far from which three young Jews were seated. These were to await their turn to be thrown into the flames for their obstinacy in not believing in Nebuchadnezzar's idols. When his time

came, Balaam rode forth, astride an ass, which stopped and refused to move, despite blows and kicks; we hear of complaints of severe treatment from the man hidden in the animal's skin. Among the prophets, Moses held the law and a rod in his hand; he wore an alb and a cope, and had horns and a long beard. Isaiah, bearded, was clad in an alb, and a red stole surrounded his forehead; Aaron wore his episcopal ornaments, held a flower in his hand, and was mitred and bearded; Jeremiah had his sacerdotal vestments and held a parchment roll; John the Baptist's feet were bare, and in his hands was the text of the Evangel. The costumes of the others were not much more diversified. Each prophet, when he had finished, stepped behind Nebuchadnezzar's furnace to await the processional which was finally to take them all to the choir.

The growth of plays by accretion, by assimilation, constituted the *cyclic* development. The unknown dramatist did not use particular plays as models, but the plays themselves were taken, as we have seen, and worked into the plot and progress of the story. In the beginning, the Christmas dramas were simply types, similar almost to the answer and response of the Church service. Presented on days of great ecclesiastical importance, these pieces were subjected to an atmosphere of growing magnificence. But as the plays increased, textually, and had introduced into them a greater number of characters, necessity pushed the purely religious elements away from the dramatic, and the latter being most popular, became dominant. As play after play was amalgamated, new points were brought in and accentuated, showing

a change of hand and a constructive mind behind the completed work. Through a period, from 900 to 1200 A.D., this evolution continued.

Wilhelm Creizenach (*Geschichte des Neueren Dramas*) summarizes the general character of the development just traced. So clear and suggestive are his remarks that in part they are here translated:

“We have seen that in spite of the varying characteristics of these festivals, and of the dramas that developed from them, many analogies between them are apparent. Above all is evident the effort to enlarge the texts more and more, at first merely by means of adding, mosaic fashion, pieces from the Gospels or from Church songs, but afterward by including pieces, which in prose or verse were especially composed for the purpose. In the verse is illustrated the gradual progress of these centuries in the art of Latin rime, and though for some time, especially in plays of the Three Kings, hexameter was used in addition to rime, yet the ascendancy was held by rhythmic poetry, which was steadily growing in beauty and elaborateness. Above all, a solemn and earnest tone is at the basis of the dramas; though, on the other hand, there are already apparent passages intended to touch the emotions, as in the parts of Mary Magdalen, of Herod, and of the foolish Virgins.

“The manner of representation was at first the simplest imaginable. There was no attempt to go further than to costume the personages of the action according to their parts, by aid of the various garments of the clergy. Nevertheless there also appeared new requirements, as a palm-branch for

the angel at the grave, or crowns for the kings. When, however, the devil, the soldiers of Herod, and the many different characters of the Prophet play appeared on the stage, a greater variety in costuming was necessary. With the development of the plays and their separation from the Church service, it is probable that more care was devoted to the adornment of the places where each individual stood, but nevertheless it seems that people were satisfied with a treatment which merely indicated the places symbolically.

“It has frequently been noticed that the early medieval drama in its development out of Church usages offers a certain analogy to the commencement of Greek tragedy. Yet in the very first stage of the medieval drama, a mark of distinction is apparent, one which ever becomes of greater significance. The dramatic portrayal of events from sacred history had the same aim as the paintings of the church, the same aim which the English *liber consuetudinum* connects with the ceremonial of the burial of the Cross on Good Friday—of strengthening the unlettered people in their belief. Such representations [as the liturgical plays] can be described as a sort of instruction by observation, in which the people, knowing no Latin, drank in with their eyes what could not come to them by merely listening. . . . Since as little as possible was or could be put behind the scenes, the spectator might see everything, and, as it were, grasp all in hand. . . .

“There was an inconvenience connected with the fact that all persons must appear and take their places on the stage at the beginning of the play,



for it was not possible thus to produce any effect of surprise by making a new personage come unexpectedly into view. Hence the medieval poets frequently excluded individual persons from the mass of the great procession at the play's opening. For instance, the composer of the French Morality *Charity* (XVth, XVIth c.—*vide* Petit de Julleville—*Répertoire du théâtre comique*) does not bring forward the terrible figure of Death at the general display with which the drama begins, but waits till the proper time in the course of the action. Scenes like the appearance of Antichrist and of King Darius, prove, however, that this effect [of surprise] was made use of at a much earlier time. Also in the oldest French play of *Adam*, the prophets are told in the stage directions to remain out of sight till the time for their part is at hand."

Concerning the manner in which the text of these liturgical plays was delivered, M. Coussemaker has collected music from these dramas, showing that most of the dialogues must have been chanted or sung. The music was not decorative, however much it might have entered into the spirit of the play.

In the tentative period, foreshadowing that of the transition and that of the XIVth and XVth centuries, when the well-known Mystery cycles were in the ascendancy, the student of medieval literature will meet

THE TRANSITION PERIOD. with great changes due to social evolution. For instance, the adoption of the vernacular was not sudden; it came slowly, introduced by means of fragmentary and explanatory passages in plays and sermons.



Starting with a purely religious motive, the drama followed the lines of social development, and was affected by social changes. The popularization of plays which were religious in character, but which were not religious plays, was coincident with the emphasis of a new class of people, which during the XIIth, XIIIth, and XIVth centuries, became a vital factor in the social organism. The dramatic elements, at first accepted as the visible exposition of a faith, and interpreted in a language unknown, save in the Church, now became in themselves an end. From the simplest suggestion, illustrative of a religious text, they developed, by enlargements and additions of various kinds, into independent plays.

On the other hand, the Church had to meet a necessity upon which her very existence was to depend. The need of making herself understood by an illiterate people brought on a gradual modification in the language, coincident with the introduction of the dramatic elements. These elements were used through necessity, but after being accepted as essential, their further development became wholly independent, corresponding with the increase of the dramatic interest of the people.

The few instances in which the vulgar tongue was used in the liturgical drama show the stress to which the clergy were put. They were either forced to meet a social demand, or to relinquish one means of their social influence, and while among themselves the Latin language might be used, they realized that a dividing line must be drawn intellectually between what was intended for the Church and for the world.

The rise of the Scholar plays, written in the Latin tongue especially for the clergy, was a partial result of this division.

The change in language hastened a period of transition in spirit, a transition from the dramatic in the religious to the religious in the dramatic. The Church became a prey to outside influences which sought to degrade the clergy; but, attacking both religious institutions and religious literature, it was easier, in the end, to restore order in the Church through canonical proscriptions of these extraneous influences than to root out from the literature a popular spirit drawn from the life of the time.

In 1125, when Abelard was offered the abbotship of the monastery of St. Gildas de Ruys, in Lower Brittany, it is said that he found the country wild; the inhabitants half-barbarous, and speaking a language unintelligible to him; the monks violent, unruly, and dissolute, openly living with concubines; the lands of the monastery subjected to intolerable burdens by the neighboring lord; and the monks in poverty and discontent. "Instead of finding a home of God-fearing men, eager for enlightenment, he found a nest of greed and corruption."

Feudalism, the foundation of the life of the Middle Ages, affected the ecclesiastical world, and class distinction among the clergy, as among the laity, made it possible for the religious office to become one of personal aggrandizement, with a power which even the nobles, which even the monarch himself, did not have! —the spiritual power of salvation or damnation. And while the heads of the Church were thus vying

with the temporal power, the subordinates, seeing the lax condition of their religious orders, took advantage, and, through negligence, often sank into ignorance and vice.

Elinand wrote: "Every prelate is established by God, above nations and above kingdoms. From the beginning, God has desired that all secular dignity should be subject to ecclesiastical authority, and dwell face to face with it in the relation of inferior to superior, of the lowest to the highest." This was the position which the Church claimed to hold, and the stronger men of the clergy, fearing that their authority was in jeopardy, soon realized the necessity of checking the degradation of the priesthood. Thus there arose the spirit of reform. The clergy began to be condemned by the clergy; the unworthy criticized by the worthy. Cardinal de Vitry taxed the prelates because of incontinency, and added: "How are we to blame the women . . . when they [the prelates] delight themselves in the weakness of gorgeous costumes. The women, at least, have for an excuse to please their husbands." Another exclaimed: "See how the bishops live, how they travel! Is it thus that their predecessors, Peter and Paul, did?" And so the more alert and the more pious began to impose restrictions upon the subordinates under their charge, and the seriousness of their calling began to be more forcibly impressed.

The allurements of the outside world had entered the cloister, and by the side of the religious and scholarly spirit of the plays there slowly developed coarser elements, which lightened the hours, and af-

forded a suspicious kind of amusement for the monks. Finding that this was detracting from the Church's chief object, restrictions were vigorously imposed.

From this it is readily seen what effect such conditions must have had upon the literature of the time. If the drama, which was to be used by the Church as a means toward an end, was to maintain the early ecclesiastical traditions, it must return to its purely religious purpose, which had formerly been fostered by the intensity of the religious spirit of the clergy. On the other hand, social conditions had so changed that the clergy found themselves confronted by elements which could not be consistently adopted, because they were fundamentally opposed to the religious spirit. Religious tradition and the new-born individuality, therefore, contended and resulted in a separation into two distinct *genres* of the drama, one for the clergy and the other for the people.

In the long history of the Church, the Church Fathers constantly opposed actors, and limited their religious privileges.\* They were assisting, so the clergy contended, in perpetuating the very amusements which paganism had fostered, and which, with so much difficulty, the early Church had opposed and partly subdued.

In a letter of 791, Alcuin, Abbot of Tours (735?-804), wrote:

“ One who brings into his house actors and mimes and dancers little knows how much impurity comes in with them.”

\* *Vide* Bibliography under H. S. Symmes [French period ].

Agobard, Archbishop of Lyons, in 836, contrasted the state of the actor with that of the poor, in this manner :

“ The actors, the mimes, and the deceiving and infamous joculators are given money to get drunk on, while the poor of the Church are dying in the agonies of hunger.”

The pleasures of the noble class, catered to by the wandering minstrel, resulted in the neglect of the poor, and became a source of constant annoyance to the Church. Otto von Freisingen, a German chronicler, describes the marriage of Kaiser Heinrich II. (reigned 1002-1024) in these words :

“ When the royal marriage was in its due course of celebration at the Castle of Ingelheim, a crowd of actors and joculators flocked there, as they had been accustomed to do. But the King sent them away empty-handed, and distributed freely among the poor what he had rescued from the servants of the devil.”

The Council of Aachen decreed that when priests went to marriages or officiated at other social functions, they must leave the house as soon as actors (“ *histriones, musici, aut mimi*”) appeared. The Fourth Lateran Council (1215), on the other hand, decreed that all Christians (including the actors themselves) should confess at least once a year, and

were there no cause for the priest to refuse, even the latter might receive communion. But if this was denied, the actor must not be allowed to enter the church, nor could he thereafter be given Christian burial. While the tone of opposition was strong, it was only the opposition of the religious spirit of the Church to a coarse and popular spirit which was becoming manifestly more imminent. Thomas Aquinas (d. 1274), in his *Summa Theologiæ*, wrote:

“As has been said, the drama is necessary in human society, . . . and the function of the actors, which is to give recreation to mankind, is neither in itself improper, nor do those persons sin who exercise it with moderation in a play. However, they must not use forbidden words, nor depict improper events, nor represent their drama at improper times. In so far as actors observe these restrictions, there is no sin in assisting them, and it is only just, moreover, to pay them for their services.”

But the prohibition against the use of coarse words, the due consideration for the content of the subject, and the time and place of presentation *were* disregarded; the decrees soon became couched in stronger and more imperative language. Innocent III., in 1210, issued the following:

“It is occasionally the custom to give dramatic representations in the church, and not only are

hideous masks employed, which make a mockery of the spectacle, but at some festivities the deacons, priests, and sub-deacons themselves perform these outrageous sports. Therefore, lest the honor of the Church be stained by such iniquity, we command that ye shall either take heed to root out from your churches that favorite custom, or see to the removal of every trace of corruption in those plays."

The prohibitions at first referred principally to the social status of the actor; but later the attitude of the Church becoming more aggressive, these prohibitions were aimed against the presentation of the drama within the church edifice, and, furthermore, against the priests taking part in any presentation whatsoever.

Examples of such restrictions came from the Council of Trèves (1227) and the Utrecht Synod (1293). The former stated:

"Priests are not permitted to give dramatic representations, or other plays of improper character, within the church."

The latter decreed:

"We forbid that dramatic representations, spectacles, and the use of masks shall take place in the churches."

The restrictions have one point in common—a

determined opposition to the coarseness and the buffoonery which had entered the liturgical drama. The same spirit which emphasized the part of Balaam and his ass in the *Prophètes du Christ* was on the alert to take advantage of every opportunity that presented itself to increase the farce element. When the prohibitions were finally enforced, the liturgical drama did not leave the church, but that popular part, from which the priests as actors were excluded, was pushed into the open, where, in a freer atmosphere, it readily assumed an independent and rapid growth. This fact, that the church now served no longer as a complete setting for the play, is one of the chief characteristics of the transition period. Within the sanctuary, whatever development there was, discordant with the religious spirit, was necessarily limited. But outside of the cloister, there were agents in the medieval life which were influencing the desires of the people, and which were serving as a stimulus to imagination. These elements acted as a foil to ecclesiastical self-restraint. And once in the churchyard, the atmosphere throughout the drama changed, became freer, became more pregnant with the individuality of the people, and began immediately to expand.

While the new characteristics introduced into the plays were opposed to the religious spirit, and aided in driving the drama into the churchyard, the clergy soon saw the necessity for retaining certain details of a popular nature, as essential to the Church as to the dramatic representations. The drama, because of its popular touches, has always appealed to the



more or less illiterate class. This the Church realized, and in order to preserve her power began to institute certain radical changes along lines similar to the changes being made in the drama she had relentlessly condemned.

Humor had to be introduced into the sermons in order to create interest. Moreover, the priest, when before his congregation, was forced to adopt some means of keeping his hearers awake. One monk gave as his reason for the non attention of the people, that their souls were not pure. Another, in the midst of his sermon, seeing tired faces and drooping eyes around him, even among his brothers of the monastery, stopped, and in a loud voice began:

“Once there was a king named Arthur.”

The effect was instantaneous; heads were raised and all showed themselves eager for the tale. But after the cure came the priestly indignation:

“When I speak of God you sleep; but to hear fables, you keep yourselves awake.”

We read of Jacques de Vitry (b. *circa* 1180; d. *circa* 1240-1260), who rose to the rank of Cardinal, advising the people before him to stick pins into those who slept. Some priests announced at the beginning of the sermon that they would be brief. In many instances, the men of the congregation left before the sermon, only to return when it was through. The cause for this seeming lack of interest was due to the fact that the congregation at first was not

considered a vital participant in the service. But when question and response were introduced into the Church liturgy, and the adoption of the vernacular in the sermon made the service partially coherent and understandable to the crowd, voices in the congregation were often raised during the progress of the sermon, disputing assertions made by the priest. Women especially took exception to the free mention of their sex in the priestly censure. Penetrating even to the cloister, these interruptions came from the clergy likewise, and were constant and vociferous.

Outside of the monastery, those of the ecclesiastical brotherhood who travelled from place to place, looking after the welfare of the people, resorted to stories or *exempla*, with which to give pungency to the moral of the sermon. So childlike, in many respects, were the people of the Middle Ages; so credulous, that it is not only reconcilable how a drama, based upon their belief, and intensified by what now seems to be superstition, should have gradually developed, but it is natural that the clergy should now reach out beyond their dogmatic prejudices, and make use of the overweening childlike desire for a story.

Among the most famous *exempla* to be found are those of Jacques de Vitry. The character of the priest's hearers necessitated a change in his method of delivery, and his tales became so much sought after that he made a collection of his *exempla* for the use of clerics and preachers. The sarcasm, the aptness, the moral behind the apparent lightness, may well be seen by quoting a few anecdotes which are of special interest because of their distinct local color:

“A certain holy man, while in choir, saw the devil loaded down with a full sack. He adjured the devil to tell him what he was carrying, and the devil replied that the sack was full of the syllables and words and verses of the psalms, abbreviated or omitted by the clergy, during that service. ‘These I diligently preserve for their accusation.’ ”

“When Jacques de Vitry was preaching the crusade in a certain town, a man was persuaded by his wife to absent himself from the sermon. From curiosity, however, he stood by the window, and heard of the great rewards in the way of indulgences, etc., promised to those who took the Cross. Moved at length by what he heard, he lowered himself from the window, because his wife was guarding the door, and took the Cross. His example was followed by many.”

“A knight, about to embark on the crusade, had his little children, whom he dearly loved, brought before him, in order that his departure might be made more bitter, and his merit increased.”

“St. Gregory tells of a woman who ate lettuce without making the sign of the Cross, and swallowed the devil. When a holy man tried to exorcise him, the devil said: ‘What fault is it of mine? I was sitting on the lettuce, and she did not cross herself, and so ate me too.’ ”

What these *exempla* emphasize is above all that even in the Church human interest was held virtually by the same means as in the religious plays. The primary purpose was to create interest; at the same

time the stories retained, to a less important degree, a touch of the religious spirit.

Once outside the church, the drama was furthered by an innate love of pomp, and by a gradual increase in local individuality, which became manifest in the establishment of gilds. But before reaching the people and becoming vital to them, the plays had to undergo another change, which came simultaneously with the introduction of the humorous elements above mentioned, and which increased their popular character. This was the change from the Latin tongue to the vernacular. In the drama, previous to this period, French or German had been used to explain the Latin text, but the ecclesiastical tongue prevailed, and examples of the popular speech were few and far between.

The innovation in language met a popular demand, and the Church realized that its power would augment only so soon as her service was understood. In different localities, various dialects of the French and German tongues had long ago developed. Naturally this had resulted in Latin becoming alien to every one, except to the ecclesiastics. At first the vernacular was simply used to translate particular portions of the Latin text, then to paraphrase them. Forming at times entire refrains, the popular speech at last predominated, with here and there a passage remaining in Latin. Finally, as in the case of two plays, *Adam* and the *Résurrection*, which are typical of this period, the drama was written entirely in the popular tongue.<sup>2</sup>

A similar evolution took place in the sermons. The

mixture called the *macaronic style* was used as early as 1262, the sermons of the XIIIth century being divided into those addressed to the faithful, which, though written in Latin, were preached in French; and those addressed to the clerks, which were delivered in Latin. In Charlemagne's time (742-814), he advised that lessons (*prédications*) be given in the dialects which the common people could understand. In 813 at Rheims, Tours, and Mayence, councils decreed that not only should the homilies of the Fathers be translated into the ordinary or popular tongue of the country ("*in rusticam romanam linguam, aut theotiscam*"), but that they should be preached in an intelligible fashion to all people, in accordance with the necessities of their language ("*secundum proprietatem linguæ*"). From the Xth to the XIIth centuries other changes were perfected. First the sermons were delivered in Latin, sections being translated by the officiant to aid the people in following the thread of the discourse; then the sermons were translated entirely, and in the XIIth century, they were circulated among the clergy. The effect of such translations in France was either to lengthen or to shorten the original, and at the head of the XIIIth century manuscripts appeared the descriptions: "*in vulgari, in latino*"; the themes, however, according to LeCoy de la Marche (*La Chaire Française*), were announced in Latin, as they are often done to-day.

Jacques de Vitry said:

"When we speak in the convents and the assemblies, *en langue latine*, we are able to say many

things, because we are not obliged to descend to minute explications; but with the laity it is always necessary to be precise, and to put dots over the i's; for the sacred word should be as clear and as lucid to them as is the carbuncle stone."

There are instances of the clergy becoming ignorant of Latin, due to this introduction of the vernacular; and in the cloister it often became necessary to have the Latin sermon followed by a French translation.

This adoption of the vernacular in the Church showed a desire on the part of the clergy to take the people more into consideration. As the drama, outside of the church, was afforded vast scope in the selection of details not purely religious, so the use of the vernacular lent a pliability to the treatment of religious material that tended to vary, rather than to fix, the dramatic forms. It likewise occasioned another change from the sung questions and responses of the Christmas and Easter celebrations to the spoken play. Music that had a vital connection with the service continued its growth; but the dramatist, through the increased dramatic instinct to write plays for their special dramatic value, evidently realized the importance of speech in the development of character. The change to the vernacular resulted in a local and personal individuality that infused renewed life into the drama, where the sung questions and responses had tended to keep all within prescribed religious bounds.

During the Middle Ages the theory of music had

attained a high development. In the Church it took the form of a chant, and in the liturgical plays it was used as a means of dramatic expression. But the earlier liturgical dramas, the *tropes*, were actual parts of the intoned service; and M. Coussemaker (*L'Art Harmon. aux XII<sup>e</sup> et XIII<sup>e</sup> Siècles*) believes that the music for them was only a liturgical chant, with the addition of a special melody for that section of the drama which was not based upon the liturgical text. On particular Church festival-days, likewise, special musical features were added as organic parts of the representations. It must be borne in mind that the liturgical music was to the Church a means toward an end, a dramatic means, moreover, of holding the interest of the people chiefly through the emotions.

At Paris, Poitiers, Trèves, Bourges, and Rouen; in the many abbeys throughout France, the most famous being that of Saint Gall (the home of the Gregorian Chant), not only religious but popular music and the dance were taught. The instructor, or leader of the choir, had as his scholars\* those who in the liturgical plays were the angels and the children gathered about the Jews. It was his duty to compose music for feast-days, and to see that nothing objectionable was introduced therein.

Popular influence soon manifested itself in the music; the Gregorian Chant, admitting of little variation, and change being characteristic of the transition period, extraneous melodies were written to

\* *Vide* Chapel boys [Babees Boke, E. E. T. S.] and Chambers, *Medieval Stage*, I, 336, The Boy Bishop.



satisfy the growing popular fancy. Several agents were at work in accomplishing this innovation, and in creating a demand for it. The troubadours, the trouvères, and the jongleurs were factors that hastened a definite separation of the religious from the popular elements in the music. As in the development of the drama, there had resulted the formation of two types rather than the entire disappearance of the parent form,—so in the music a popular spirit was furthered, which did not replace the religious music, but created alongside of it a popular form, largely of the wandering minstrels' making. Indirectly this was another cause which tended to hasten the transplanting of the drama from the altar to the churchyard.

"In 1227," says Léon Gautier, "the Council of Trèves launched a severe anathema against vagabond scholars, truants, and 'goliards,' " who appeared in the churches and monasteries, singing and bringing with them the ways of the outside world. As early as the Xth century, errant clerks among the clergy, becoming a disgrace to their orders, were made to flee the monasteries. Incensed, they spread evil influences among the people and evil reports concerning the Church among the poor. They introduced love songs of a ribald character into plays, and many elements antagonistic to the religious spirit; they entered the churches and sang the *Sanctus* and *Agnus Dei* in such a manner as to lead the congregations astray. After services, beneath the walls of the cloister, they harangued against Rome and the Pope. Into the plays they introduced obscenities and passions worldly in the extreme, and set religious words



to a new form of music, which the people readily grasped and enjoyed.

The jongleurs, as these outcasts were sometimes called, were an ancient class. They were in demand in the Middle Ages to create amusement for the people. They produced *chansons de gestes*, plays, and light songs, and sang them before lords and people. On the battle-field, in the castle, upon the street they found their audiences, and were showered with gifts and flattered with the deepest attention. They depicted life and action of the most varied kind; in their persons they exemplified freedom; and with these characteristics they opposed the old religious spirit of the liturgical plays.

The constant association of the jongleurs with the people began through popular allusions and local touches to affect their work. While there is extant no definite description of a French audience witnessing a drama, still there must have been no very wide difference between such an audience and the crowd surrounding the jongleurs in the street and at the Court.

In the introduction to their songs, these wandering minstrels very frequently address those about them in the following manner:

Seignors Roi, Prince et Comte, Chevalier et Baron,  
Bourgeois, canoine prestre, gent de religion,  
Dames et damiselles et petit enfanchon, etc.

(Rom. des vœux du Paon.)

Seignors or entendez chevaliers et sergents, Bourgoises et bourgeois et saiges clerks lisant, etc.

(Rom. d'ogier le Danois.)

But it is to be noted with interest that the common people are not even mentioned in this quotation. The minstrels, especially the *trouvères* and *troubadours*, were nothing if not aristocratic in their tastes, and knowing this, it must not be inferred that the people, other than those of high rank, were not gathered around the bard in the public squares.

Within the church the congregation was ranged in a circle, and was divided, the men on one side and the women on the other. The noble ladies, when they came, brought with them soft seats, carried by their attendants, while the other seats were furnished by the church; previous to the XIIIth century, in France, all people had been compelled to stand, and the nobles and chevaliers were consequently not over-enthusiastic in attending service. Jacques de Vitry exclaims:

“You, on the contrary, would force the priest to finish the Mass promptly, to abandon yourself leisurely to the pleasures of the table.”

This mixed character of the worshippers within the church, was also marked among the crowd outside; all classes of the feudal system were represented. Lord and lady, knight and squire, monk, merchant, artisan, and serf came to divine worship, and when the plays developed in dramatic content, more and more people flocked to see them until they overflowed the church limits, causing the drama to pass into the churchyard. Again we find an analogy in the placing of pulpits in the churchyard, and in

the clergy haranguing the crowd from the church steps or gate.

Written in the vernacular, with only the stage directions in Latin; spoken rather than sung, with a definite attempt on the part of the author to depict character in his dialogue, and played outside of the church—these are the points about the drama most important in this transitional period, especially as illustrated by the play of *Adam*—transitional, because as yet fresh from the Church, it retains some of the religious atmosphere.

The *Adam* play is the product of the *cyclic* development—showing in crystallization what, step by step, the German plays better exemplify. The *Résurrection* (XIIth century) is a fragment, but in it is found the first example of a play entirely spoken rather than intoned. Both of the plays are French, and are in part still *semi-liturgical*, for they were represented within the shadow of the church edifice, the actors in many cases coming from the church into the yard.

The *Adam* play, represented, in all probability, at the feast of Christmas, begins with the scenic background of a terrestrial paradise, built upon a scaffold to the right of the church and to the left of the spectators, and reached by ladders. The platform was spacious, surrounded by curtains and silken hangings, so arranged as to conceal all but the heads and shoulders of those who were in paradise. Trees, laden with fruits, leaves, and flowers, pictured a garden of "marvelous beauty," in the midst of which a great tree, the acme of medieval art, was placed

with a mechanical serpent wound around its trunk. To the left of the church and to the right of the spectators was hell, with a grilled window and having for an entrance the enormous mouth of a dragon, which opened and shut mechanically. From the stage directions we learn :

“ The Saviour shall come, clad in the habit of a bishop ; before him Adam and Eve. Adam shall be dressed in a red tunic, Eve in a white costume for a woman, with a silk cloak also of white. Adam shall stand nearer to God in an attitude of respectful fear, while Eve shall be placed lower. Adam must be properly taught when to make his replies, for fear of speaking too soon or too late ; not only he but all the others should be instructed to speak suitably, and to match their gestures to their words ; in the recitations they shall neither add nor take away a syllable, but needs must pronounce clearly, and speak one after the other, following the order indicated. Every time any one of them mentions Paradise, he shall turn from the side where he finds himself, and shall point to it with his hands. The play shall begin by reading the verses : *In principio creavit Deus cælum et terram. . . .* After which the choir shall sing : *R. Formavit igitur Dominus. . . .* This done, God shall say *Adam* and the latter shall reply *Seigneur.*”

The Biblical text is adhered to closely. The story of Adam and Eve is followed by that of Cain and

Abel, and the scene with the prophet is reminiscent of the *Prophètes du Christ*. Satan flatters Eve in the following figurative way:

You are such a feeble and tender thing,  
You are as fresh as the rose,  
You are whiter than the crystal,  
Like the snow on the ice in the valley.  
The Creator has mated you badly;  
You are tender, Adam is stern.  
You are so much wiser than he, . . .  
That is why it is good to be near you.

In the presentation of the *Résurrection*, the platform was divided into many *stations* or fixed positions where the actors stood, supposed to be invisible during the progress of that part of the action in which they had no share. There was a place for the Crucifix and one for the tomb; there was a jail for the prisoners, and a heaven and a hell. Here stood Caiaphas, there Pilate; on one side the disciples, on the other side the three Marys. Galilee was in the middle of the platform. It is to be noted that in England there were often required several *pageant wagons* for a single play, each one fulfilling the same object as the so-called *station*.

The plot of the drama unfolds, and the climax is reached in the scene with Joseph and Nicodemus before the Cross. Nicodemus, taking his tools, bemoans the fact that the Jews, his own people, should have aided in the Crucifixion; Joseph says to him: "Go first to the feet." To which Nicodemus rejoins:

“Willingly, sir, and most carefully.” Again Joseph speaks: “Climb to the hands and remove the nails.” And Nicodemus replies: “Sir, I shall certainly remove both of them.” This done, Nicodemus says to Joseph, who holds the body, “Take it gently in your arms.” “That is what I am doing,” he says, and together they descend from the Cross, and call for the ointments which their servants bring. The play ends with the scene preceding the realization of the Resurrection.

In *Adam* not only are the stage directions written in Latin, but also the verses introducing each prophecy. While the representation was given in the churchyard, God, the sacred character in the action, came from the church. The people still considered the church, as M. Sepet has said, consecrated to religion as the terrestrial image of a celestial region. The play must be regarded as the product of a consistent development, constructed by an unknown author, probably an ecclesiastic; written in pure Norman dialect, and acted somewhere in the neighborhood of Caen, or Rouen, or Bayeux by an organization called the *puy*.<sup>3</sup>

*Adam* is the result of the union of three pieces. It is evolved from the *Prophet play*, since Adam was considered a prophet. His sin was looked upon as a necessary event preceding the birth of Jesus, and God expressed as much when turning Adam out of paradise. Abel likewise symbolized the Redeemer. It is thus natural that Eve and Cain should be included by the medievals as among the prophets. Having then these four in the procession of the

prophets, the next step was the development, in length, of the several prophecies and the gradual assertion of the details in each, terminating in a separation of the two groups into two distinct plays. But as we have seen in our study of the *cyclic* development of the Christmas and Easter plays, borrowing was a favorite practice among clerical dramatists, and soon the author of *Adam*, finding material already at hand, fused the *Adam* and *Cain* and *Prophet* plays into one, and added thereto his individual touch.

It is probable that the *Adam* play is the product, therefore, of four distinct moves, which M. Sepet (*Les Proph. du Christ*), groups as follows:

1. Adam and Abel are introduced into the *Prophètes du Christ*.

2. Their rôles increase, becoming two small scenes analogous to those of Nebuchadnezzar and Balaam.

3. These scenes increase and separate, forming two distinct dramas.

4. Then these two dramas, still more developed, are placed side by side, the scene of the prophets being added.

5. In turn the *Adam* play becomes the germ of a greater Mystery of the XVth century.

Outside of the church the drama still clung to Biblical subjects, and was followed by the choir, which remained for some time an essential feature. Sepet says, however, it is easily seen that "the actor is able to move freely in the framework" and to produce the play, not only as an officiant, but as a true



artist. Nevertheless he adds that the actors of the *Adam* play "appear still singularly rigid, singularly dominated by the exigencies of the liturgy, if compared with the actors of Shakespeare's time, or even with those of the large Mysteries of the XVth and XVIth centuries."

A greater departure from the liturgical drama is further seen in the *Résurrection* play. Notwithstanding that it is a fragment of only 366 verses, it shows a more pronounced development in design and character sketching; the Latin, likewise, has entirely disappeared, save in the names of the characters. It reveals an evident aim at realism, at portraying sacred subjects not simply for the religious story's sake, but because of an undisguised interest in the characters themselves. The play begins with the words, *Let us recite*, and inasmuch as the action is told in the directions, it might be inferred that it was recited or read, rather than represented.

*Adam* and the *Résurrection* are typical in their religious content of the plays of the earlier centuries. But a certain change in spirit, furthered by the addition of purely dramatic outward details, marks them as of the transition period. The two manuscripts contain thorough directions for acting, as thorough as those declaimed by *Hamlet* to the players; everywhere there is evidence of the fact that the writer was striving for artistic effect. To the church building, that had once been sufficient as scenic background, were added mechanical contrivances, which were used primarily for theatrical purpose: to make the progress of a Biblical story realistic, more life-



like. Coming from the church, the actors brought with them the costumes of the holy celebrants, which rapidly assumed a mixed character, due to the influence of other than the religious spirit. It is true that the vital religious incidents in the plays retained their serious character even after the drama had passed entirely from Church control. Not one touch of humor can be found in the *Résurrection* centering about the Crucifixion; but in *Adam*, freed from religious restraint and dogmatic reserve, the touch of the dramatist became bolder. The art side of the *Résurrection* is nevertheless apparent in the unconscious childlike realism of the Cross scene; while in the *Adam* play there is evident the hand of a playwright who knows much of human character, and aims to portray it. No more natural, no more crafty scene, is to be met with than that in which Satan obtains control over Eve; nothing more human can be found than the rapid dialogue between Cain and Abel, in which the latter hears of his approaching death. In the mortification of Adam, in the humiliation of Eve after the Fall, there is no mere paraphrasing of the Biblical text. There is creative force that knows the value of human emotion, that realizes a situation where art can be made effective.

The plays reveal a double picture: the one, a spectacular scene from the Bible; the other, a reflex of the life of the people themselves. The effort to amuse is a conscious one, and it was by dramatic means that such effect was accomplished. The followers of Satan, the demons with their outward antics, satisfied the coarse and awed the timid. Coming forth when

Eve wavers before the forbidden apple, they rush among the people, finally arriving at Eve's side and yelling into her ear, "*eat, eat.*" The popularity of Satan and his confrères is evident by the frequent use made of them. Adam and Eve are both dragged in chains to hell; Cain and Abel are likewise taken and after each prophecy, the prophets meet with the same fate. As the demons have no set speeches in the plays, their random gestures and their roars must have appealed to the audiences. Hell itself was depicted with elaborateness, and with as many realistic touches as mechanical ingenuity could supply.

The transition period, if looked upon as a part of a continuous development of the drama, shows all the elements of the modern theatre in the germ. Up to this time there had been a general evolution—one stream of the religious drama, wherever the religious spirit was to be found. But once beyond the transition, once beyond the limitations of an unknown tongue, the stream took many courses which developed separately. The nations with the greatest power of assimilation, with the most vigorous capacity for growth, became the most important centres for the new dramatic spirit. The exact time when the national lines were drawn is impossible to state. The drama's growth was a continuous unfolding, the plays of England, France, and Germany becoming distinct just as soon as the dramatist became an individual in the general social life, rather than a mere factor in the life of the Church. The introduction of the several languages would in itself have been sufficient to cause a separate development of

the drama in the different countries, for language was one of the most important of national characteristics. England, France, and Germany<sup>4</sup> each had its period of transition, in which a drama was slowly created for the people, and became a part of the local life. The ecclesiastic could not be a dramatist so long as the religious spirit restricted him, but as soon as the plays were taken into the free atmosphere of the world, the dramatist grew in strength and his genius became more dominantly dramatic.

The effect of this transition period was therefore to emphasize the characteristics due to this national feeling. As long as the dominant note in the existing life was spiritual, so long did the drama remain within the church, with an appeal far above the heads of the average, save for the pantomime introduced. This was the common lot of the beginnings of the drama in England, France, and Germany—the three started from the same point in the development, and as the years progressed they diverged into three national branches, each with separate characteristics due to environment, language, and all elements that give the individual stamp to a nationality. But this change was not due to any marked revulsion from the spirit of the early drama.

Within the free atmosphere of an awakening humanity, the drama broadened and began to show something of a more personal nature. In France, during the XIIIth century, two plays may be fixed as to authorship; but to offset these, there are forty Miracles which are subject to conjecture as to composition. Jehan Bodel and Rutebeuf both lived dur-

ing the reign of Saint Louis (1226-1276) and from autobiographic data we learn that Bodel had leprosy, which cut him off from society, while Rutebeuf, a veritable Villon before Villon's time, courted favor, was extravagant, and loved good cheer. Bodel's *St. Nicholas* and Rutebeuf's *Théophile*<sup>5</sup> are valued for their local touches rather than for their art workmanship; the latter shows no dramatic strength, but contains the XIIIth century spirit and that element dominating nearly all of the French plays of the period—namely, “the intervention of heaven and hell in the destiny of a human creature.” This is also the particular note throughout the forty *Miracles de Notre-Dame*.

Bodel's *St. Nicholas*, based on the popular legend of the thieves and the treasure hidden in a figure of the saint, is much more pretentious than Rutebeuf's dramatic attempt, and abounds in local color. The author exhibits his skill in a tavern scene where the robbers form their plot, and his situations are varied. The *Miracles de Notre-Dame* were in all probability presented or written about the middle of the XIVth century, occupying thus a position on the threshold of the medieval drama at its height. And these plays show a firmer treatment than either the plays of Bodel or Rutebeuf—a bolder design, a surer dramatic hand, a more psychological analysis; their presentation is a matter of conjecture, but it is safe to say that they were fostered by one of the numerous *puy*s of the time.

The separation into distinct national dramas makes

it evident that, in the limits of an Introduction, some proscription must be made. In France ENGLAND. and Germany the material for the student is rich and varied; in England the dramatic art at its height is best typified in the *cycles*, mention of which is now to be made.

It must be understood that the English development went through the same phases as have just been traced. Individual activity here began at a time when France had passed through its strictly clerical period of drama, and when the infusion of Norman blood immediately after the Conquest, encouraged among the English people a pronounced encroachment of the Norman tongue. The history of the English language shows the struggle between the two for ascendancy.

The religious dramas of France were undoubtedly an influence in the history of the English drama, but it is sufficient to note that notwithstanding all their national characteristics, the general trend of development in the different countries was the same.

One of the earliest plays on English soil is of the XIIth century, the *Ludus de S. Katharina*, played at Dunstable, and probably written in French. It was presented by the pupils of Geoffrey, Abbot of St. Albans. Furthermore, three Latin plays by Hilarius (*circa* 1125), dealing with the story of *Daniel*, the *Raising of Lazarus*, and the *Miracles of St. Nicholas*, were presented in the first half of the XIIth century. Of London Miracles (*circa* 1170-1182), William Fitzstephens wrote:

“It [London] has entertainments of a more devout kind, either representations of those Miracles which were wrought by holy confessors, or those passions and sufferings in which the martyrs so rigidly displayed their fortitude.”

By the time of Chaucer, the Mystery play, with its pageant in the open, was well established, and formed a most important part in the rise of municipal life. The growth of the great cycles was, in fact, coincident with the growth of cities.

The Mysteries of the XIVth and XVth centuries, no longer controlled by the clergy, were supported by the guilds of England and the *puy*s and *confréries* of France. Each guild had a patron saint, whose day was observed, and as time went on, rivalry grew among the organizations as to the superior merits of the presentations, resulting thereby in remarkable pageants and wonderful artistic ambitions. If there were nothing more in the Mystery plays than mere interest in local atmosphere, rather than in the workmanship of the playwright, we could not help but admire the stupendous effort of these medieval artisans to present graphically and appropriately the story of the Bible. The whole sweep of events in the Great Book was not too much for presentation, even though it took many days. These were the times for the cycles of thousands of verses. France treasures for the zealous student more than one million lines. The *Mystère du Vieil Testament*, a combination of six Mysteries, is told in fifty thousand verses. Nothing seemed to daunt the dramatist; he dealt with

largeness everywhere; the centre of action was at any place; the extent of time was from the creation of the world to the judgment.

The development of the gilds is in itself a study of great interest and importance. The rise of the cities was fostered by the mercantile or commercial spirit, which prompted the union of interests to protect trade. But the Gild Merchant, the history of which is ably set forth by Mr. Charles Gross in his *The Gild Merchant*, was so conservative as to hinder the free progress of trade, and by its very nature became a monopolist of the most oppressive kind. In the XIVth century, the non-gildsman was practically debarred from earning a livelihood; foreigners, entering a city, were subject to the most scrutinizing regulations, except on Fair days, when the restrictions were removed. A reference to the Gild Merchant is found as early as 1087 and by the XIIIth century, at least one-third of the boroughs throughout England could boast of such organizations. The spirit of the gild is well shown by a grant from Edward I., dated 1296, to such a body in Chester. It reads in part:

“No one who is not sworn and admitted into the aforesaid gild can merchandise in the said town without the license and consent of the said burgesses.”

The craft gilds<sup>7</sup> were a later development than the Gild Merchant, and while an artisan always had the opportunity of becoming a master, the craft was not endowed with all of the important privileges pos-



sessed by the Gild Merchant. This union of the workers of one trade had economic results that were far-reaching, since the desire was to make the very best product, and since the supervision of the work was most rigid and adhered to a high standard of excellence. The members of the Gild Merchant, as time went on, rapidly assumed important positions in municipal life; the craft guilds, being more representative of the working people, exerted more influence upon the local town life; the two, however, were alike subject to royal decree and to general municipal orders.

In those days religious fervor never lost entire control over daily life, and it is easy to imagine how the guilds formed the idea of presenting the Mysteries. The plays, before they were actually mounted by the guilds, were thoroughly familiar to the people in subject matter. So that on festival-days, especially on the days of patron saints, the guilds gradually took it upon themselves each to present a portion of the Bible story, an incentive to do so having already been found, on the one hand, in the existing dramas which served as models, and, on the other, in the extensive development of magnificent processions, encouraged by royalty and by the body ecclesiastical.

Royal entries into cities imposed upon such cities the obligation of entertainment and welcome. Among the many entries, the following may be mentioned:

1293—Welcome to Edward I. upon his return from Scotland. London guilds marched in a pro-



cession with what appear to have been moving pageants indicative of trade.

1313—Mute play of the history of Jesus Christ from Nativity to Passion, performed at Paris, before Edward II. and his wife.

1420—Dec. 1—Entry of Charles VI. and Henry V. into Paris; mute Mystery, with stationary pageants representing a connected story, the Passion of Our Saviour.

1430—Entry of Henry VI. into London; stationary pageants; verses and some speaking.

The establishment of the Corpus Christi festival, by Pope Urban IV. (*circa* 1264), resulted a century later in the founding of gilds under that name. The Fraternity of Corpus Christi of the Skinners of London dates from 1327. Mr. Charles Davidson (*Eng. Myst. Plays*) quotes as follows from the *Survey of London*:

“This fraternity had also once every year, on Corpus Christi day afternoon, a procession which passed through the principal streets of the city, wherein were borne more than one hundred torches of wax (costly garnished) burning light, and above two hundred clerks and priests, in surplices and capes, singing. After the which were the sheriff’s servants, the clerks of the compters, chaplains for the sheriffs, the mayor’s sergeants, the counsel of the city, the mayor and aldermen in scarlet, and then the Skinners in their best liveries.”

As the interest in these presentations increased, the

gilds assessed their members more and more, in order to defray expenses, and later on the municipal authorities themselves fined the gilds for failure to present their pageants properly.

A discussion of the English Mysteries necessitates an explanation of the terms *Mystery* and *Miracle*. The Mysteries were all narratives based on the Gospels, "their object," says A. W. Ward, (*Eng. Dram. Lit.*) "being primarily to set forth, by an illustration of the prophetic history of the Old Testament, and more particularly of the fulfilling of the New, the central mystery of the Redemption of the world, as accomplished by the Nativity, the Passion, and the Resurrection." The Miracles, on the other hand, deal only with legends of the saints; no better examples of such can be found than the *Miracles de Notre-Dame*, already mentioned.

The progress of the name in France is thus outlined by Petit de Julleville (*Hist. Théât. en Fr: Les Mystères*):

XIIth century—the liturgical dramas were called *ludi, representationes, historiæ repræsentandæ*. The *Adam* drama was designated *représentation*.

XIIIth century—Bodel's *St. Nicholas* called *jeu*; Rutebeuf's play, however, called a *Miracle*.

XIVth century—dramas called *Miracles*.

It is interesting to note that before the XVth century the word *Mystère* was not used in France. In 1402 Charles VI. founded the *Confrérie de la Passion*, and used the term in connection with them.

In examining a series of plays that form each a part of the same development, and, written prac-

tically with the same object in view, cover the same ground in content, one must expect to find similarities, and both conscious and unconscious imitation on the part of the playwrights.

Of the manuscripts that have come down to us, the greatest interest centres about the cycles of York, Towneley, Chester, and Coventry; but within the limits here prescribed it is best to take whatever will give the most satisfactory picture of the scope and presentation of the Mystery at its height.\*

The York manuscript that is now available bears the probable date of transcribing, *circa* 1430-1440, and contains forty-eight dramas; the Towneley plays, in a manuscript likewise of the XVth century, are thirty-two in number; the Chester manuscript dates from 1591†-1607 and numbers twenty-five plays: while the Coventry plays, forty-two in all, are dated in manuscript *circa* 1468. These dates are most likely many years after the actual first presentation, but they serve the purpose of establishing some definite period, yielding as the limits may be.

Of these cycles only one bears any indication of probable authorship. While the composition of the Towneley plays has been traced to the cell of the Augustinian or Black Canons at Woodkirk, and while the Coventry Mysteries have been attributed to the Grey Friars of Coventry, in the Chester cycle

\* *Vide* Chambers, II., 407, Appendix X.

† Schelling dates 1475. These indications vary with different authorities. The Chester Manuscript bears interesting comparison with the French *Mystère du Vieil Testament*: Chambers, II, 409; Gayley, *Forefathers*, 128 *seq.*

there has been much discussion as to whether or not the author was one "Randall Higgenett, a monk of Chester abbey." There is slight evidence, however, to support his claim.

It will be seen that despite the national characteristics infused into the drama, the playwrights still remained in touch with the Church, and continued to trace, however freely, the same stories that formed the basis of the religious drama at its beginning. While we have a present-day drama, directly evolved from the XVth century development, it was not the whole stream of dramatic art that turned into the channels which were to give us Shakespeare; there came a period when there were two streams running side by side—the modern drama as we know it, and the religious drama that still continued its course for some time before its decline. But there is no question that these monks, these playwrights, now handled material for effect; they had the sense of the artist, and though they borrowed, in many cases they improved upon the original; though in other instances there was a sad falling-off in workmanship.

Much profit may be obtained in studying a comparative table of the four cycles, which is printed in Miss L. Toulmin Smith's edition of the *York Mysteries*.<sup>8</sup> At a glance we see the vast scope of this panoramic progress of Bible story, strangely intermingled with local color and local allusions. Sometimes we find an amalgamation of several plays into one pageant, and we infer by this that a gild, failing to furnish its quota, had its pageant privileges annulled and its play transferred to another gild that

could well afford to present two pieces. Miss Smith writes:

“As business grew, a new craft would spring up, an old one decay and become too poor to produce its play; a new one must take its share; one craft trenching on the trade of another must share its burdens; sometimes two or even three plays would be combined into one; sometimes a play would be laid aside, and the craft to which it had been assigned must join in producing some other.”

In Coventry, under date 1494, “it is therefore ordained that the Mayor, and 8 of his council shall have authority to join all such Crafts to those that are overburthened with the said Pageants, with power to levey penalties in case of refusal.” In Coventry, in 1523, one gild is recorded as offering aid to another in presenting a pageant.

However these plays may have been divided originally, the ones extant show clearly that the idea of the dramatist was to produce something that would be *actable*. And there was art in his execution; nowhere do we see such variety of poetic form, where lines and rime schemes vie with each other and are consciously introduced in order to gain particular effect. And though the medieval dramatist was still a monk, oftentimes he foreshadowed Shakespeare in his wonderful intermingling of the tragic and the humorous; not so subtle, nor so fine, perhaps, but used in a way to reveal a due sense of proportion.

These English cycles show that in many of the plays scenes were taken bodily from elsewhere, and were retouched by a newer hand. Miss Smith, with several of her York plays, prints the Towneley texts covering the same subjects, and even a cursory examination reveals convincing similarities. Mr. A. W. Pollard in his edition of the Towneley Mysteries also calls attention to this relation existing between five plays, where the York manuscript served as foundation for the Towneley. For example, in *The Departure of the Israelites from Egypt* [Y. XI; T. XIII, Pharaoh] the connection between both cycles is striking:

*Towneley.*

Pharao. Peas, of payn that no man pas,  
           But kepe the course that I commaunde,  
 And take good hede of hym that has  
           Youre helthe alle holy in hys hande;  
 For kyng Pharro my fader was,  
           And led thys lordshyp of thys land;  
 I am hys hayre as age wylle has,  
           Euer in stede to styr or stand.

*York.*

1 Rex. O pees, I bidde that noman passe,  
           But kepe the cours that I commaunde,  
 And take gud heede to hym that hasse  
           Youre liff all haly in his hande.  
 Kyng Pharo my fadir was,  
           And led the lordshippe of this lande,  
 I am hys hayre as elde will asse,  
           Euere in his steede to styrr and stande.

Again:

*Towneley.*

Primus Miles. A, my lord!  
 Pharao. haghe!  
 Secundus Miles. Grete pestelence is comyn;  
 It is like ful long to last.  
 Pharao. In the dwilys name!  
 Then is oure pride ouer past.

*York.*

1 Egip. My lorde, grete pestelence  
 Is like ful lange to last.  
 Rex. Owe! come that in oure presence?  
 Than is oure pride al past.

This comparison is further illustrated by *The Harrowing of Hell*, which is imbedded in the *Résurrection* of the Coventry cycle. Turning to the Chester plays, evidence of similarity with the Towneley manuscript is likewise illustrated by Mr. Pollard in the following:

*Towneley.*

Erthly man, that I haue wrought,  
 Wightly wake, and slepe thou noght!  
 With bytter bayll I haue the boght,  
 To make the fre;  
 Into this dongeon depe I soght  
 And all for luf of the.

*Chester.*

*Eirthly man that I have wroughte,  
 Awake out of thy slepe;*

Earthly man, that I haue wrought,  
Of me thou have no kepe.  
From heaven man's soule *I soughte*  
Into a *dongion depe*  
My dere lemon from thense I broughte  
For ruthe of her I weepe.

Thomas Wright, editor of the Chester cycle, supports Collier (*Hist. Eng. Dram. Poet.*), who calls attention to a partial resemblance between the Chester plays and the French Mysteries. The two French pieces mentioned as typical examples of the transition period have their counterpart in *The Creation* (T.I.) [*Adam*] and *The Crucifixion* (T. XXIII) [*Résurrection*]. A glimpse into this comparative work will justify the assertion that individuality to the XVth century playwright meant the individual stamp on all material whether old or new, rather than the creation each time of new plots and new situations. It likewise shows that, from the constructive side, one may trace, in the partiality to particular metres, the hand of the individual craftsman through many plays, and Mr. Pollard has applied this analysis in the case of what he calls the "one real genius" of the Towneley cycle.

M. de Julleville in his illuminating work on *Les Mystères*, in dealing with the characteristics of the French plays, writes that the authors probably realized the profound unity of their subject, and sometimes were successful in sustaining it; but under the multiplicity of details more often was the unity lost, and for this reason it was easier for the later dra-



matic tinker to amalgamate plays into immense cycles. Wherever the dramatist could, he introduced his local studies and gave to them his own individual touch; for, as the same writer says, the medieval public enjoyed tracing in the characters before them the language, habits, and sentiments of their neighbors. The tragic, pathetic, idyllic, comic, realistic, and satiric spoken of by John Addington Symonds (*Shakespeare's Predecessors in Eng. Dram.*) are all important elements in the Mysteries; the dramatist becomes human in a free atmosphere.

One has but to read the dialogue that passes between Abraham and Isaac to understand the effect it must have had upon a medieval audience, witnessing a father about to slay his son. Note this from the Chester manuscript (*IV. The Sacrifice of Isaac*):

*Abraham.* O! comelye creature, but I thee kille,  
I greve my God, and that full ylle;  
I maye not worke againste his will,  
But ever obediente be.

O! Isaake, sonne, to thee I saie,  
God hath commaunded me to daye  
Sacrifice, this is no naye,  
To make of thy bodye.

*Isaake.* Is yt Godes will I shalbe slayne?

*Abraham.* Yea, sonne, it is not for to leane;  
To his byddinge I wilbe bayne,  
And ever to hym pleasinge.

But that I do this dilfull deede,  
My Lorde will not quite me in my nede.

*Isaake.* Marye, father, God forbydde.

But you doe your offeringe!  
 Father, at home your sonnes you shall fynde,  
 That you must love by course of kinde:  
 Be I onste out of your mynde,  
     Your sorowe maie sone cease;  
 But yet you muste do Godes byddinge.  
 Father, tell my mother for no thinge.

Here we find the Bible situation, embellished with that simplicity which is art because it is simple. The pathos increases in the scene preceding the one where the angel stays the hand of Abraham:

*Abraham.* Fare well, my sweete sonne of grace!

*Here let Isaake kneele downe and speake.*

*Isaake.* I praye you, father, torne downe my face  
 A littill, while you have space,  
     For I am full sore adreade.

*Abraham.* To doe this deed I am sorye.

*Isaake.* Yea, Lorde, to thee I call and crye,  
 Of my soule thou have mercye,  
     Hartelye I thee praie!

. . . . .

*Isaake.* A! mercye, father, why tarye you soe?  
 Smyte of my head, and let me goe.  
 I praye you rydd me of my woe,  
     For nowe I take my leue.

*Abraham.* Ah, sonne! my harte will breake in three,  
 To heare thee speake such wordes to me.  
 Jesu! on me thou have pittye,  
     That I have moste in mynde,

We can further imagine the enjoyment of that humor which smacked of village gossip in such scenes as the one in which Noah, just before the flood, tries to get his wife on board the Ark. She refuses to stir unless her companions may come with her. Our reading is from Chester III., *Noah's Flood*:

*Noye.* Good wyffe, doe nowe as I thee bydde.  
*Noyes Wiffe.* Be Christe! not or I see more neede,  
Though thou stande all daye and stare.

Noah apostrophizes on the ways of women; the medieval dramatists take especial delight in depicting for the benefit of young men the direful results of married life. Noah calls aloud:

For all the wene that thou arte maister,  
And soe thou arte, by Sante John!

Then after discussing the ways and means of getting her aboard, the family group decide to use force:

*Noye.* Come in, wiffe, in twentye devilles waye!  
Or elles stand there without.  
*Cam.* Shall we all feche her in?  
*Noye.* Yea, sonnes, in Christe blessinge and myne!  
I woulde you hied you betyme,  
For of this flude I am in doubte.

*Jeffatte.* Mother, we praye you all together,  
For we are heare, youer owne childer,  
Come into the shippe for feare of the  
weither,

For his love that you boughte!  
*Noyes Wiffe.* That will I not, for all your call,  
 But I have my gossippes all.  
*Sem.* In faith, mother, yett you shalle,  
 Wheither thou wylte or note [not].  
*Noye.* Welckome, wiffe, into this botte.  
*Noyes Wiffe.* Have thou that for thy note!  
*Noye.* Ha! ha! marye, this is hotte!

The realism that marks the French play of the *Résurrection* of the XIIIth century is repeated with great similarity in *The Crucifixion* of the Towneley cycle, (XXIII) where Longeus pierces Jesus with his knight's spear, and also where Joseph and Nicodemus take the body from the Cross:

*Joseph.* Nychodeme, com me furthe withe,  
 ffor I myself shallebe the smythe  
 The nales out for to dray.

The strange introduction of a humor that is coarse and cruel, yet probably characteristically local and realistic, if it were possible to forget that it was spoken during the Crucifixion, is found in the scene with Christ's torturers, who fight over their share in the work. In that same play there is the scene with John and Mary before the Cross, where the uncontrollable grief of the mother for her "swete son" reminds one forcibly of the German *Marienklagen* of the latter part of the XIIIth century. Here the universal human asserts itself over the religious significance; the human mother cries aloud with a human

grief, and the medieval audiences shed tears in sympathy:

ffestynd both handys and feete  
with nalyys fulle unmete,  
his woundes wryngyng wete,  
Alas, my childe, for care!

A student of these Mysteries will find them anything but dull reading. They are full of a surprising freshness that blossoms forth when least expected. There is no more delightful dialogue than that found in the Towneley play of *The Shepherds* (XII [2], XIII [2]), where the atmosphere is as complete, according to our views, as any modern dramatist could have made it. These Mysteries and Miracles afford us a rich field for watching the personality assert itself, irrespective of any religious limitations.

One finds the village boy as menial to Cain; one notes God vowing "in the name of the holy gast"; the medieval dramatist did not care for accuracies, and he sought effect through means close to hand and familiar to his time. Considering the Towneley plays alone, a few local allusions are found in the following:

In *The Prophets* (T. VII), David says, "Shalle I now syng you a fytt, Withe my mynstrelsy"; on coming out of the Ark (T. III), Noah discovers castles and towns swept away; the Shepherds, on hearing the angel's song announcing the birth, try to imitate it (T. XII):

*ijus pastor.* Now, by god that me boght | it was a  
mery song;

I dar say that he broght | foure &  
twenty to a long.

And when the Child is seen, the Shepherds greet him as Duke and Knight. One speech in the second Shepherd's play is a dissertation on the Shepherd's lot—"no wonder that [they] are poor, they are so oppressed by the gentle folk." There are also seen the elements of a *farce* in the character Mak, who steals a sheep from the Shepherds.\* Christ is called King of "towne and towre"—and Herod wonders "who the dewill made hym Knyght." Truly the dramatist was a representative of his time, and no richer picture could be drawn than from these stray passages that reveal all but the sweep of life itself, the whole husk with a goodly part of the spirit in it.

The early Church Fathers sought to give the congregation a picture, and the later drama retained this idea; it was a panorama, to be unfolded in a public square, and to be spoken by actors who were paid for their services. It has been said that to the XVth century audience the Ark was as real as are the caravels of Columbus to us of the present time. The theory that drama is a reflex of life is well supported by the fact that the atmosphere of a life over four hundred years ago is still mirrored in the words that brought forth actual tears and laughter from the motley medieval crowd.

The presentation of the English Mysteries can only be pictured by taking here and there whatever presents itself, and piecing together so as to gain

\* This is one of the first examples of a *farce* in early English literature.

effect. Much in these plays was left to the imagination of the spectators, the merest suggestion covering an entire scene. The word *pageant*, which in the Coventry manuscript has been spelt in about twenty-three different ways, was applied to the structure which moved from street to street, as well as to the play itself. Archdeacon Rogers (d. 1595), who witnessed a play at Chester, thus describes a *pageant*:

“The maner of these plays weare, every company had his paigant, or p<sup>te</sup>, w<sup>ch</sup> paigants weare a high scaffold w<sup>th</sup> 2 rowmes, a higher and lower, upon 4 wheeles. In the lower they apparrelled themselves, and in the higher rowme they played, beinge all open on the tope, that all behoulders might heare and see them. The places where they played them were in every streete. They began at the Abay gates, and when the first paigante was played, it was wheeled to the highe crosse before the Mayor, and so to every streete, and soe every streete had a paigant playinge before them at one time, till all the paigantes for the day appoynted was neere ended, worde was broughte from streete to streete that soe they mighte come in place thereof, exceedinge orderlye, and all the streetes have their paigantes afore them all at one time playeinge togeather; to se w<sup>ch</sup> playes was great resorte, and also scaffoldes and stages made in the streetes in those places where they determined to playe their paigantes.”

The following item of expense in the Coventry records is of interest:

1450—Spend to bryng the pagent in to gosford  
stret . . . . v<sup>d</sup>

The gilds of the Cappers and the Drapers each employed twenty men to drag their pageants, which have been compared with the floats used annually during the New Orleans *Mardi Gras* festivities. Some accounts show that to accommodate spectators at Coventry and Chester, stages upon wheels were pulled near the pageant for special benefit and better view.

The French *mansions* or stations were large enough to show much detail. At Valenciennes, in 1547, a row of columns supported Paradise; Nazareth was a wall pierced by a door between two Doric pillars; Jerusalem was shown in the same way. A pavilion, with columns, a throne, and the figure of a King, represented the palace, while a square basin holding water was the sea. So simple were these details and yet withal so necessary to correct understanding!\*

The actors in England were usually members of the gilds; clerics in lower orders of the Church sometimes participated. It is curious to notice how the rôles in the Biblical story were apportioned according to a peculiar harmony existing between the part itself and the trade of the individual. In the time of the Mayoralty of William Alne, of York, in the third year of the reign of Henry V., 1415, according to a list compiled by the town clerk, one Roger Burton (the list is quoted in Miss Smith's *York Myster-*

\* An excellent cut of this is reproduced in Gayley, *Forefathers*, op. p. 216.



ies), the Plasterers were assigned the Creation of the World, the Shipwrights were the builders of the Ark, the Chandlers were the Shepherds who carried the Star, and further down the list we find the butchers assisting in the Crucifixion.

The actor's art has now become a paying one. Does not God receive ij<sup>s</sup> and Pilate receive 4<sup>d</sup> for playing each his part?

Again we note "It' payd to God, xx<sup>d</sup>;" "It' payed to the mynstrells;" and "It' paide to the sprytt of god. . . xvj<sup>d</sup>." More often do we hear in the Coventry records of the feasts of the actor.

In 1490:

Itm for IX galons of Ale. . . . . xvij<sup>d</sup>

Itm for a Rybbe of befe & j gose . . . . . vj<sup>d</sup>

Again in another place Pilate is allowed wine while performing, and the pageant *drivers* are given drink to cheer them on the road.

In the XIIIth and XIVth centuries the French actors were furnished by the *puy*s and later by the *confréries*. Before the XVth century organized companies were formed, and those who took part in the Mysteries were bound by special contract. A number of rehearsals were given before the public performance. On the appointed day the actors reported at seven in the morning; some of the audience arrived at four, so eager were they for a good place near the pageant wagon.

There was a so-called *cry* at one time in France, an august person whose object was to beg citizens

to take part in the coming play, and he went about in goodly procession, with trumpeters, archers, soldiers, and heralds. Even though the drama had left the Church, priests still took important rôles: among notices of such we are told that in 1409 and 1437 at Metz, a priest and two curates acted the parts of Christ, St. John and Judas. Women figured very rarely in the English and French presentations. Before 1550 France had but three exceptions, one in especial being in 1468, when a girl of eighteen appeared as St. Catherine (2,300 verses) and was so appealing in her tender beauty as to make a young nobleman fall in love with her and marry her.

The rôles were often long and arduous. Christ, in one French play, had to recite 4,000 verses; in 1437, at Metz, during the Crucifixion scene, both Christ and Judas were prostrated on account of the continuous emotional strain. The *Christus* of the latest performance of the *Oberammergau Passion Play* (1900) has graphically described his painful sensations while on the Cross.

The costumes used in the early religious dramas were nothing more than ecclesiastical robes, and instances are known, even during the advanced stages of the XVth century, of the clergy lending their vestments to the gild actors. But oftenest in England the expense of such detail was charged to the gild itself, and from the old records one is able to gain some definite knowledge of the theatrical wardrobe. The Smith's Company of Coventry, in 1449, presenting the *Trial, Condemnation, and Crucifixion of Christ*, mentioned among their machinery a Cross

and ropes with which to draw it up, besides gallows and a scaffold; the Cross was often painted in gold. Among the dresses we note black buckram hung with nails and dice for the tormentors, and a white leather coat for God:

God (Jesus)—Coat of skin, sometimes painted and gilded. False hair powdered in gold.

Spirit of God (as distinct from God—probably the Holy Ghost?)—A coat of buckram, very likely painted.

Caiaphas and Annas—Robes of Christian Bishops; with hoods (1486) made of red (1487); wearing “myttyr” painted with “gold foyle & sylv foyle.”

Herod—A mask, painted. Satin and blue “bokeram.” Sceptre and helmet of gold and silver (1499).

Judas—Red hair and beard.

The Draper's Pageant presenting *Doomsday* in 1534 required a barrel for the earthquake, three worlds, and “a link to set the world on fire”; among the dresses there were “coats for the black and white souls,” but no mention is made of the costumes for the “two worms of conscience” that figure among the characters.

The stage manager was ingenious in his settings and costuming, seeking color and splendor in tinsel, such as constitute the modern stage accessories. Where his mechanical inventiveness resulted in a realistic hellmouth, his enthusiasm knew no bounds; nor

did he fail to express his pleasure over the beauty of Paradise, such as is described in *Adam*. "Behold," cries the author of a French Passion of 1534, "here is the most beautiful Paradise you have ever seen or ever will see."

The hellmouth was a pit and demons vanished therein from among the audience, through the mechanical jaws of a wonderfully constructed dragon, from whose depths groans and even flames and smoke would issue. These latter details were regarded as the acme of medieval scenic art. We read that at one performance, through carelessness, the "fireworks" went off in hellmouth before the appointed time, creating consternation among the people.

All these details appealed to a childlike simplicity that explains the thunder by the pushing of a table across the floor, and believes the rain comes from a watering-pot sprinkling the world. These plays were witnessed by royalty, and by all sorts and conditions of people, even the wanderer along the roadway. We see the crowd in Chaucer's *Prologue* to the *Canterbury Tales*, a crowd well-nigh level as regards intellect, if not alike as regards rank, and all of them capable of enjoying the same kind of amusement. The elements that have thus been described in detail brought this particular drama to its height; already, in the cycles, there were beginning to be shown signs of generalizing rather than of defining characters.

Ward (*Eng. Dram. Lit.*) claims that while the Morality plays are not unconnected with the Miracle

plays, their origin reaches farther back, even to the Biblical abstractions which are in themselves the very foundations of the Christian worship. "It seems probable that inasmuch as our literature had more distinctly than that of almost any other modern nation a specifically Christian origin, so it was the Bible itself which implanted in the English mind its ineradicable love for allegory, and for religious or moral allegory in especial." Ten Brink (*Hist. Eng. Lit.*, tr. Robinson) writes: "The Moral plays owe their origin to the same spirit that introduces the so-called allegorical tendency into religious literature and court poetry; viz., to the effort to illustrate moral doctrines and present abstract ideas in bodily form"; and further adds: "The Mysteries had undeniably a great influence on the formation of the Moral plays."

Certain it is that even before the definite appearance of the Moralities\* the way was being prepared for them, since we meet with abstractions in the great cycles just examined; *Veritas*, *Justicia*, *Pax*, and *Misericordia* appear in the eleventh Coventry play [*The Salutation and Conception*], and *Death* is introduced into the same collection. It is not to be doubted that Catholicism and the pending Reformation both reached into literature for some existent vehicle to carry their polemics, and found none better than these Morality plays.

\* *Vide* Chambers, II, chap. xxiii, p. 149, Bibliographical Note; also *ibid*, Appendix X, p. 436.

But though religion fell back upon the drama a second time for help, it was an ethical and dogmatic motive, rather than a religious one, that fostered the moral plays; and, besides, the people were no longer so submissive mentally; they were alive to the value of the dramatic impulse, and were thinking for themselves.

Mr. Pollard, in his interesting collection of specimens from the early English drama (*Eng. Mir. Pl.*), prints some passages from what may be called a transitional type, which stands between the definite Mystery and Morality, but which includes elements characteristic of all three types—Mystery, Miracle, and Morality. It is entitled *S. Mary Magdalene*, and is preserved in manuscript *circa* 1480-1490. In part it adheres to the story of Mary's fall, and gives the scene in which Jesus cleanses her of her sin; it likewise sounds the note of boasting, characteristic of the heathen monarch who, in so many of the plays, defies Christianity; therein is it purely Mystery. On the other hand, Mary is beset by *Flesh*, who sends *Luxuria* to tempt her, and lead her before a *galaunt*, and *Satan* rejoices over her fall; therein is it markedly a Morality. But in the restoration of the life of a Queen and her Child, through the assistance of Mary, it is characteristically a Miracle, in the sense familiar to the student of the French *Miracles de Notre-Dame*.

A list of Morality plays would include, as among the most important, and all of the XVth century: *The Castell of Perseverance*; *Mind, Witt, and Understanding*; *Mankind* (*Humanum Genus*); *Mundus et*

*Infans*; *The Pride of Life* (Fragment); *Everyman*; and *Nature* (by Henry Medwall). Mr. Pollard speaks of the didactic Moralities, among which may be mentioned the following groups, enumerated by Miss Bates:

(a) Dealing with Temptations of Youth: *Hycke-Scorner*, printed circa 1530 (Interlude). *Lusty Juventus*, 1547-1553. *The Interlude of Youth*, 1553-1558.

(b) Written in Praise of Learning: *The Nature of The Four Elements* (Interlude), 1510-1570. *Wyt and Science* (by John Redford, circa 1545).

The very names themselves reveal the character of these dramas. Of them all, none would approach in completeness and unity of development, the Morality play of *Everyman*. We find abstractions walking across the narrow pageants, and rolling forth long disquisitions on the evils of life of which they themselves are the symbolical types. Castles are besieged by good and by evil angels; *Humanum Genus* falls beneath the wiles of *Luxuria* in female attire, and is saved therefrom by *Confession*. One of the closing scenes in the *Castell of Perseverance* is that in which *Humanum Genus* (Mankind) is debated over in heaven by *Misericordia* and *Pax*, who plead for him, and *Veritas* and *Justitia* against him, with the final salvation of *Humanum Genus* through the mercy of *Pater sedens in trono*. The dramatist, with a broad sweep similar to that with which the Miracle playwright reviewed the entire Bible history from the creation to the judgment, carried man from infancy



to old age; brought *Folly, Lust, Wantonness* before him; had *Pity, Misery, Compassion, Repentance*, and *Confession* save him, all in the semblance of personalities talking in a manner which the unskilled art of the writer could not save from dulness or from verbosity.

The *Castell of Perseverance* (middle of the reign of Henry VI) is one of the oldest Moralities extant. However, Miss Smith, in the preface to her *York Mysteries*, mentions a play that antedates this one considerably. "Once on a time," runs the preamble to the ordinances of the Gild of the Lord's Prayer, "a play setting forth the goodness of the *Lord's Prayer* was played in the city of York; in which play all manner of vices and sins were held up to scorn, and the virtues were held up to praise." Miss Smith likewise notes that a *Creed Play* was performed in York "about Lammastide every tenth year, and five such performances, beginning in 1483,\* are recorded." Still another play, the manuscript of which is lost, is mentioned as being given at York in 1558 and 1572. Mr. Pollard writes: "In that year, however, Grindal was Archbishop of York, and demanded that a copy of the play should be submitted to him. The copy was sent, and its return requested three years later, but thenceforward we hear of it no more. The loss is irreparable, for this is the earliest Morality play of which we have any mention, and must have been written nearly a century before the *Castell of Perseverance*."

\* Chambers (II, 120) says, "bequeathed to the gild of Corpus Christi in 1446"; see also II, 154.



The Moralities were used as a mode of expression, just as the didactic method distinguished the Socratic school. Even as in *Everyman*, there is detected a strong note of Catholicism, so in later plays the cause of Protestantism was as strongly argued. Not only did obscure writers turn their attention toward this form of literary dramatic expression, but acknowledged poets also, such as John Skelton, with his *Magnyfycence*, adopted it also. The young Shakespeare himself became familiar with the later-day Moralities, and perhaps gained from them the lesson that, after all, drama represents a struggle of soul; he realized this when he became the dramatic poet—and put his vivid figures on the stage, producing in them, by the sheer force of his art and craftsmanship not so much the struggle of a world-soul as the struggle of the individual “against a sea of troubles.”

The presentation of the Morality plays was almost similar to that of the Mysteries. Pageants were used, except in those cases where the special purpose was to entertain a noble company in a banquet-hall. Then a short play was selected and a strolling company was hired to give it. Over their wine, the goodly assemblage applauded the slender cast, and because of the fact that these plays were acted during the course of the meal they derived the name, *interlude*.

In Sharp's book on Coventry [*Disser. on the Pag. of Cov.*], a cut accompanies the manuscript of the *Castell of Perseverance*, representing a castle. The following directions which accompany the drawing are quoted in Pollard:\*

\* *Vide Chambers*, II, Appendix X, 437.

"+this is the watyre a bowte the place, if any dyche may be mad ther it schal be pleyed; or ellys that it be strongly barryd al a bowte: & lete nowth over many stytelerys (marshalmen?) be withinne the plase."

Over the Castle: "This is the castel of perseveranse that stondyth in the myddys of the place; but lete no men sytt ther for lettyng of syt, for ther schal be the best of al."

Beneath the Castle is a Bed: "Mankynde is bed schal be under the castel, & ther schal the sowle lye under the bed tyl he shal ryse & pleye."

On each side of the Castle: "Coveytyse copbord schal be at the ende of the castel, be the beddys feet."

Five stations for scaffolds are indicated: "Sowth, Caro skaffold—West, Mundus skaffold—Northe, Belyal skaffold—North East, Coveytyse skaffold—Est, deus skaffold."

These directions were given to actors: "& he that schal pley belyal, loke that he have gunne powder brennyng in pypys in his hands and in his ers, etc., whanne he gothe to batayle. . . . the iiij dowters schul be clad in mentelys, Mercy in wyth, rythwysnesse in red al togedyr, Trewthe in sad grene, & Pes al in blake, and they schul pleye in the place al to gedyr tyl they brynge up the sowle."

Collier (*Hist. Dram. Poet.*) has gathered together some scattered details regarding the presentation

of these plays. We learn that *Vice*, the companion of the Devil, wore a long coat, and was often given a dagger cut from a lath. Of this character much is made; he is the precursor of the court jester and the familiar Fool of Shakespeare. In *Moral, Will, and Understanding*, *Wisdom* is clad in "a rich purple cloth of gold," and wears "a beard of gold," a "cheveler," and "a rich imperial crown thereupon, set with precious stones—in his left hand a ball of gold with a cross, and in his right hand a regal sceptre." *Anima* enters "as a maid, in a white cloth of gold, gaily purfled with minever, a mantle of black thereupon, a cheveler like to *Wisdom*, with a rich chaplet laced behind, hanging down with two knots of gold and side tassels."

Mr. Pollard writes:

"In one part of the play a procession was formed of the *Five Wyttes* (or, as we should say, *five senses*) as 'five vyrgynes, with kertyllys and mantelys, and chevelers and chappelettes,' singing an anthem, 'and they goyng before, *Anima* next, and her folowyng *Wysdom*, and after hym *Mynde*, *Wyll*, and *Undyrstondynge*, all iii in wyght cloth of golde, cheveleryde and crestyde in sute'; and in another place there enters a dumb show of 'six dysgysyde in the sute of *Mynde*, namely, *Indignation*, *Sturdiness*, *Malice*, *Hastiness*, *Revenge* (or *Wreche*), and *Discord*, 'with rede berdes and lyons rampaunt on here crestes and yche a warder in his honde.' "

With the exception of *Everyman* it is conceded

that the Moralities are dull, and without sufficient action to sustain interest. Isolated passages possess considerable literary skill. When *Everyman* first meets with *Dethe*, there is a song upon his lips, but no words to that effect are extant in the text as we have it. Songs, however, are not foreign to the Morality; in the Protestant interlude of *Lusty Juventus* occurs this happily conceived lyric:

In a herber green, asleep where as I lay,  
The birds sang sweet in the middes of the day;  
I dreamed fast of mirth and play:  
In youth is pleasure, in youth is pleasure.

Methought I walked still to and fro,  
And from her company I could not go:  
But when I waked, it was not so:  
In youth is pleasure, in youth is pleasure.

Therefore my heart is sorely pight,  
Of her alone to have a sight,  
Which is my joy and hearts delight:  
In youth is pleasure, in youth is pleasure.

It now remains for us to say a word concerning *Everyman* and the purpose of this introduction has been accomplished. Ten Brink and Collier assign this Morality to the reign of Edward IV. (1461-1483); and as to authenticity, it is regarded by some as the translation from a Dutch play, *Elckerlijck*. The author of this original has been traced by Dr. Henri Logeman to one Petrus Dorlandus of Diest,

who was probably some theologian, judging by the sectarian spirit breathed throughout the play.\*

Karl Goedeke (*Everyman, Homulus, und Hekastus*) has traced, from the standpoint of international literature, the direct forebears and contemporaries of *Everyman*. It has been shown by him that the central idea of our Morality—that of proving one's friends—is traceable in many of the early parables from various countries. *Everyman*, we find, was itself appended to the *Legenda Aurea* of Jacobus Voragine (d. 1298), writes Ward, "as a later addition in a brief form derived from the *Speculum Historiale*, a compilation of the XIIIth century by Vincentius of Beauvais. But there can be no doubt that the story itself is a parable narrated in the religious romance of *Barlaam and Jehosaphat*, which has been ascribed to John of Damascus, who died in 780, but is now held to be more probably the work of his younger namesake, afterwards Patriarch of Antioch, who died in 1090."

Contemporaneously with *Everyman* stands the Dutch *Elckerlijck* already mentioned, upon which Christian Ischyrius (*circa* 1536) based a Latin version entitled *Homulus*. This in turn was translated into Dutch and Low German. Ward notes that "the publisher of the Latin *Homulus* sought to add to its attraction by prefixing to it a series of scenes, taken in part from the contemporary Latin comedy

\* K. H. de Raaf inverts the relation (*Cf.* Chambers, II, 439; also Bibliographical Note, Schelling's *Elizabethan Drama*, I, 57. In *Forefathers*, Gayley, p. 296, compares *Everyman* in severity of treatment with *Samson Agonistes*; *cf.* also Chambers, *Academy*, April 18, 1903, p. 394.)

of *Hekastus*, by Macropedius, which was independently derived from the same sources as *Everyman*, and which was itself followed by a long series of reproductions and imitations in Germany."

Four early imprints of *Everyman* are at present known:

(a) A fragment consisting of two-thirds of the manuscript, and now preserved in the British Museum: "Imprynted at London in Flete Strete by me Rycharde Pynson prynter to the Kynges moost noble grace." [1509-1530.]

(b) A second fragment in the Bodleian Library: "Imprynted at London in Flete Strete at the Sygne of the George by Rycharde Pynson prynter unto the Kynges noble grace." [1509-1530.]

(c) Two manuscripts edited by John Skot, one contained in the library of a Mr. Huth, and the other in the Salisbury Cathedral. [1521-1537.]

(d) Another Skot edition in the Britwell Library: "Imprynted at London in Poules chyrche yarde by me John Skot." [Cf. Chambers: 1529-1537.]

Of these, Pynson's manuscripts are the older. He himself came to England from Normandy, *circa* 1490, and in 1509 was appointed special printer to King Henry VIII.

Professor Brander Matthews, in an article on *The Mediæval Drama* (*Mod. Philol.*, June, 1903) writes:

"The Morality was an attempt to depict character, but with the aid of the primary colors only,

and with an easy juxtaposition of light and darkness. Yet it helped along the development of the drama, in that it permitted a freer handling of the action, since the writer of *Moralities* had always to invent his plots, whereas the maker of *Mysteries* had his stories ready-made to his hand; the *Morality* was frankly fiction, while the *Miracle* play gave itself out for fact. Then also the tendency seems irresistible, for any author who has an appreciation of human nature, to go speedily from the abstract to the concrete, and to substitute for the cold figure of *Pride* itself the fiery portrait of an actual man who is proud."

And it is in exactly this point that *Everyman* is superior to other *Moralities*. *Dethe*, *Knowledge*, *Good Deeds*, *Everyman*—in fact, nearly all the abstractions—assume individualities that make them moving forces in the drama. There are instances of conventional forms throughout the play, and there are set speeches that show it to be markedly a "morall playe." There may be an overweight in the abstract group of *Strengthe*, *Beaute*, and *Dyscrecyon*, and touches that are even didactic and dogmatic, but the struggle of *Everyman* is the struggle of a person as well as of a type. Inasmuch as the play represents a struggle, it is a drama, and it matters little if you call it *Hamlet* or *Everyman*, the abstract instantly becomes the concrete, and the symbolism of an idea becomes changed into a human fact.<sup>9</sup>

MONTROSE J. MOSES.





HERE BEGYNNETH A TREATYSE HOW  
THE HYE FADER OF HEVEN SENDETH  
DETHE TO SOMON EVERY CREATURE  
TO COME AND GYVE A COUNTTE OF  
THEYR LYVES IN THIS WORLDE, AND  
IS IN MANER OF A MORALL PLAYE.<sup>1</sup>



## DRAMATIS PERSONÆ <sup>2</sup>

MESSENGER

GOD

DETHE

EVERYMAN

FELAWSHYP

KYNDREDE

GOODES

GOOD DEDES

KNOWLEGE

CONFESSYON

BEAUTE

STRENGTH

DYSCRECYON

FYVE WYTTES

AUNGELL

DOCTOUR





CHARACTER GROUP.



MESSENGER.<sup>3</sup>

**I** Pray you all gyve your audyence  
And here this matter with reverence,  
By fygure a morall playe;  
The somonyng of Everyman called it is,  
That of our lyves and endyng shewes  
How transytory we be all daye.  
This mater is wonders <sup>4</sup> precyous,  
But the entent of it is more gracyous  
And swete to bere awaye.  
The story sayth—Man, in the begynnynge  
Loke well, and take good heed to the endyng,  
Be you never so gay;  
Ye thynke synne in the begynnynge full swete,  
Whiche in the ende causeth the soule to wepe,  
Whan the body lyeth in claye.  
Here shall you se how Felawshyp and Jolyte,<sup>5</sup>  
Bothe Strengthe, Pleasure, and Beaute,  
Wyll fade from the as floure in Maye;  
For ye shall here how our heven kynge  
Calleth Everyman to a generall rekenyng.  
Gyve audyence and here what he doth saye.





## EVERYMAN

### GOD SPEKETH: <sup>6</sup>

**I** Perceyve here in my majeste  
How that all creatures be to me unkynde,  
Lyvyng without drede in worldly prosperyte;  
Of ghostly <sup>7</sup> syght the people be so blynde,  
Drowned in synne they know me not for theyr God;  
In worldely ryches is all theyr mynde.  
They fere not my ryghtwysnes, the sharpe rood;  
My lawe that I shewed whan I for them dyed,  
They forgete clene, and shedyng of my blode rede;  
I hanged bytwene two it can not be denyed;  
To gete them lyfe I suffred to be deed;  
I heled theyr fete, with thornes hurt was my heed.  
I coude do no more than I dyde truely,  
And now I se the people do clene forsake me:  
They use the seven deadly synnes dampnable,  
As pryde, coveytyse, wrath, and lechery,  
Now in the worlde be made commendable.  
And thus they leve of aungelles the heavenly company;  
Every man lyveth so after his owne pleasure,  
And yet of theyr lyfe they be nothyng sure.  
I se the more that I them forbere  
The worse they be fro yere to yere;  
All that lyveth appayreth <sup>8</sup> faste,  
Therefore I wyll in all the haste  
Have a rekenyng of every mannes persone.

[For

For, and I leve the people thus alone  
 In theyr lyfe and wycked tempestes,  
 Veryly they wyll become moche worse than beestes—  
 For now one wolde by envy another up ete;  
 Charyte they do all clene forgete.  
 I hoped well that every man  
 In my glory sholde make his mansyon,  
 And therto I had them all electe;  
 But now I se, lyke traytours dejecte,  
 They thanke me not for the pleasure that I to them  
                     ment,  
 Nor yet for theyr beyng that I them have lent.  
 I profered the people grete multytude of mercy,  
 And fewe there be that asketh it hertly;  
 They be so combred with worldly ryches,  
 That nedes on them I must do justyce,  
 On every man lyvyng without fere.  
 Where arte thou, Deth, thou mighty messengere?

DETHE.

Almighty God, I am here at your wyll,  
 Your commaundement to fulfyll.

GOD.

Go thou to Everyman,  
 And shewe hym in my name  
 A pylgrymage he must on hym take,  
 Whiche he in no wyse may escape;  
 And that he brynge with hym a sure reckenyng  
 Without delay or ony taryenge.

[Dethe

## DETHE.

Lorde, I wyll in the worlde go renne <sup>9</sup> over all,  
And cruelly out serche bothe grete and small.  
Every man wyll I beset that lyveth beestly  
Out of Goddes lawes, and dredeth not foly.  
He that loveth rychesse I wyll stryke with my darte,  
His syght to blynde, and fro heven to departe,  
Excepte that almes be his good frende,  
In hell for to dwell, worlde without ende.  
Lo, yonder I se Everyman walkynge;  
Full lytell he thynketh on my comynge!  
His mynde is on fleshely lusts and his treasure;  
And grete payne it shall cause hym to endure  
Before the Lorde, heven kyng.<sup>10</sup>  
Everyman, stande styll. Whyder arte thou goynge  
Thus gayly? hast thou thy Maker forgete?

## EVERYMAN.

Why askest <sup>11</sup> thou?  
Woldest thou wete [know]?

## DETHE.

Ye, syr, I wyll shewe you:  
In grete haste I am sende to the  
Fro God, out of his mageste.

## EVERYMAN.

What sente to me?

[Dethe

DETHE.

Ye, certaynly.  
Thoughe thou have forgete hym here,  
He thynketh on the in the hevenly spere,  
As, or we departe, thou shalt knowe.

EVERYMAN.

What desyreth God of me?

DETHE.

That shall I shewe the:  
A rekenynge he wyll nedes have  
Without ony lenger respyte.

EVERYMAN.

To gyve a rekenynge longer layser [leisure] I  
crave;  
This blynde mater troubleth by wytte.

DETHE.

On the thou must take a longe journey,  
Therefore thy boke of counte with the thou brynge,  
For, tourne agayne thou can not by no waye;  
And loke thou be sure of thy rekenynge,  
For before God thou shalte answeere and shewe  
Thy many badde dedes and good but a fewe,  
How thou hast spent thy lyfe, and in what wyse  
Before the chefe lorde of paradyse.  
Have ado <sup>12</sup> we were in that waye,  
For wete [know] thou well, thou shalte make none  
attournay.

[Everyman

EVERYMAN.

Full unredy I am suche rekenynge to gyve.  
I knowe the not! What messenger arte thou?

DETHE.

I am Dethe, that no man dredeth.  
For every man I reste <sup>13</sup> and no man spareth,  
For it is Goddes commaundment  
That all to me sholde be obedyent.

EVERYMAN.

O Dethe, thou comest whan I had the leest in  
mynde!  
In thy power it lyeth me to save;  
Yet of my good wyl I gyve the, yf thou wyl be kynde,  
Ye, a thousande pounce shalte thou have,  
And <sup>14</sup> dyfferre this mater tyll another daye.

DETHE.

Everyman, it may not be by no waye; <sup>15</sup>  
I set not by golde, sylver, nor rychesse,  
Ne by pope, emperour, kynge, duke, ne prynces;  
For, and I wolde receyve gyftes grete,  
All the worlde I myght gete;  
But my custome is clene contrary.  
I gyve the no respyte; come hens and not tary.  
[Everyman

## EVERYMAN.

Alas! shall I have no lenger respyte?  
 I may say, Dethe gyveth no warnynge.  
 To thynke on the it maketh my herte seke,<sup>16</sup>  
 For all unredy is my boke of rekenynge.  
 But,<sup>17</sup> xii yere and I myght have abydynge,<sup>18</sup>  
 My countynge boke I wolde make so clere,  
 That my rekenynge I sholdē not nede to fere.  
 Wherefore, Dethe, I praye the, for Goddes mercy,  
 Spare me tyll I be provyded of remedy.

## DETHE.

The avayleth not to crye, wepe, and praye,  
 But hast [haste] the lyghtly that thou were gone this  
     journaye,  
 And preve [prove] thy frendes, yf thou can;  
 For, wete [know] thou well, the tyde abydeth no  
     man,  
 And in the worlde eche lyvyng creature  
 For Adams synne must dye of nature.<sup>19</sup>

## EVERYMAN.

Dethe, yf I sholde this pylgrymage take,  
 And my rekenynge suerly [surely] make,  
 Shewe me, for saynt Charyte.  
 Sholde I not come agayne shortly?

## DETHE.

No, Everyman, and thou be ones there,  
 Thou mayst never more come here,  
 Trust me veryly.

[Everyman

EVERYMAN.

O gracyous God in the hye sete celestyall,  
Have mercy on me in this moost nede!  
Shall I have no company fro this vale terestryall  
Of myne acqueynte that way me to lede?

DETHE.

Ye, yf ony be so hardy  
That wolde go with the and bere the company.  
Hye the that thou were gone to Goddes magnyfy-  
cence,  
Thy rekenynge to gyve before his presence.  
What, wenest [thinkest] thou thy lyve is gyven the,  
And thy worldely goodes also?

EVERYMAN.

I had wende [thought] so veryle.

DETHE.

Nay, nay; it was but lende the,  
For as soone as thou arte go,  
Another a whyle shall have it and than go ther fro,  
Even as thou hast done.  
Everyman, thou arte made [mad], thou hast thy  
wyttes fyve,  
And here on erthe wyll not amende thy lyve!  
For sodeynly I do come.

[Everyman

## EVERYMAN.

O wretched caytyfe, wheder [whither] shall I flee,  
 That I myght scape this endles sorowe?  
 Now, gentyll Deth, spare me tyll to morowe,  
 That I may amende me  
 With good advysement!

## DETHE.

Naye, therto I wyll not consent,  
 Nor no man wyll I respyte;—  
 But to the herte sodeynly I shall smyte  
 Without ony advysement.  
 And now out of thy syght I wyll me hy;  
 Se thou make the redy shortely,  
 For thou mayst saye, this is the daye  
 That no man lyvyng may scape a waye.

## EVERYMAN.

Alas! I may well wepe with syghes depe!  
 Now have I no maner of company  
 To helpe me in my journey, and me to kepe,  
 And also my wrytyng is full unredy.  
 How shall I do now for to excuse me?  
 I wolde to God I had never be gete!<sup>20</sup>  
 To my soule a fulle grete profyte it had be,  
 For now I fere paynes huge and grete.  
 The tyme passeth—Lorde, helpe, that all wrought!  
 For though I mourne, it avayleth nought.  
 The day passeth, and is almost ago [gone];  
 [I wote



I wote not well what for to do.  
To whome were I best my complaynt to make?  
What, and I to Felawshyp thereof spake,<sup>21</sup>  
And shewed hym of this sodeyne chaunce!  
For in hym is all myne affyaunce;  
We have in the worlde so many a daye  
Be good frendes in sporte and playe.  
I se hym yonder certaynely;  
I trust that he wyll bere me company,  
Therefore to hym wyll I speke to ese my sorowe.  
Well mette, good Felawshyp, and good morowe.

## FELAWSHYP SPEKETH:

Everyman, good morowe, by this daye.  
Syr, why lokest thou so pyteously?  
If ony thyng be amysse, I praye the me saye,  
That I may helpe to remedy.

## EVERYMAN.

Ye, good Felawshyp, ye;  
I am in greate jeopardde.

## FELAWSHYP.

My true frende, shewe to me your mynde;  
I wyll not forsake the to my lyves ende,  
In the waye of good company.

## EVERYMAN.

That was well spoken and lovyngly.

[Felawshyp

FELAWSHYP.

Syr, I must nedes knowe your hevynesse;  
I have pyte to se you in ony dystresse.  
If ony have you wronged,<sup>22</sup> ye shall revenged be,  
Though I on the grounde be slayne for the;  
Though that I knowe before that I sholde dye.

EVERYMAN.

Veryly, Felawshyp, gramercy.

FELAWSHYP.

Tusshe! by thy thanks I set not a strawe,  
Shewe me your grefe, and saye no more.

EVERYMAN.

If I my herte sholde to you breke,  
And than you to tourne your mynde fro me,  
And wolde not me comforte whan ye here me speke,  
Than sholde I ten tymes soryer be.

FELAWSHYP.

Syr, I saye as I wyll do in dede.

EVERYMAN.

Than be you a good frende at nede,  
I have founde you true here before.

[Felawshyp



“COMMAUNDED I AM TO GO A JOURNAYE.”



## FELAWSHYP.

And so ye shall evermore,  
For, in fayth, and thou go to hell,  
I wyll not forsake the by the waye.

## EVERYMAN.

Ye speke lyke a good frende, I byleve you well;  
I shall deserve it, and I maye.

## FELAWSHYP.

I speke of no deservynge, by this daye,  
For he that wyll saye and nothyng do,  
Is not worthy with good company to go;  
Therefore shewe me the grefe of your mynde  
As to your frende moost lovyng and kynde.

## EVERYMAN.

I shall shewe you how it is:  
Commaunded I am to go a journaye  
A longe waye, harde and daungerous,  
And gyve a straye counte<sup>23</sup> without delaye  
Before the hye judge Adonay.<sup>24</sup>  
Wherfore, I pray you, bere me company,  
As ye have promysed, in this journaye.

## FELAWSHYP.

That is mater in dede! Promyse is duty;  
But and I sholde take suche a vyage on me,  
I knowe it well it sholde be to my payne;  
Also it makes me aferde, certayne.

[But

But let us take counsell here as well as we can,  
For your wordes wolde fere a stronge man.

EVERYMAN.

Why, ye sayd if I had nede,  
Ye wolde me never forsake, quicke ne deed,  
Though it were to hell, truely.

FELAWSHYP.

So I sayd certaynely ;  
But suche pleasures be set asyde, the sothe <sup>25</sup> to saye,  
And also, yf we toke suche a journaye,  
Whan sholde we come agayne?

EVERYMAN.

Nay, never agayne tyll the daye of dome.

FELAWSHYP.

In fayth, than wyll not I come there.  
Who hath you these tydynges brought?

EVERYMAN.

In dede, Dethe was with me here.

FELAWSHYP.

Now, by God that alle hathe bought,  
If Dethe were the messenger,  
For no man that is lyvyng to daye  
I wyll not go that lothe journaye,  
Not for the fader that bygate me.

[Everyman

EVERYMAN.

Ye promysed other wyse, parde.

FELAWSHYP.

I wote [know] well I say so, truely,  
And yet yf thou wylte ete and drynke and make good  
chere,  
Or haunt to women the lusty company,  
I wolde not forsake you whyle the daye is clere,  
Trust me verily.

EVERYMAN.

Ye, therto ye wolde be redy:  
To go to myrthe, solas, and playe,  
Your mynde wyll sooner apply  
Than to bere me company in my longe journaye.

FELAWSHYP.

Now, in good fayth, I wyll not that waye:  
But, and thou wyll murder, or ony man kyll,  
In that I wyll helpe thee with a good wyll.

EVERYMAN.

O, that is a symple advyse in dede!  
Gentyll Felawe,<sup>26</sup> help me in my necessity;  
We have loved longe, and now I nede!  
And now, gentyll Felawshyp, remember me.

FELAWSHYP.

Wheder ye have loved me or no,  
By saynt John, I wyll not with the go.

[Everyman

EVERYMAN.

Yet I pray the, take the labour, and do so moche  
for me,  
To brynge me forward<sup>e</sup>,<sup>27</sup> for saynt Charyte,  
And comforte me, tyll I come without the towne.

FELAWSHYP.

Nay, and thou wolde gyve me a newe gowne,  
I wyll not a fote with the go;  
But and thou had taryed, I wolde not have lefte the  
so;  
And as now, God spede the in thy journaye!  
For from the I wyll departe as fast as I maye.

EVERYMAN.

Wheder awaye, Felawshyp? wyll you <sup>28</sup> forsake  
me?

FELAWSHYP.

Ye, by my faye! To God I betake the!

EVERYMAN.

Farewell, good Felawshype! For this my herte is  
sore.  
Adewe forever, I shall se the no more!

[Felawshyp



## FELAWSHYP.

In fayth, Everyman, fare well now at the ende,<sup>29</sup>  
For you I wyll remember that partynge is mourn-  
ynge.

## EVERYMAN.

Alacke! shall we thus departe in dede?  
A! Lady, helpe, without ony more comfote,  
Lo, Felawshyp forsaketh me in my moost nede.<sup>30</sup>  
For helpe in this worlde wheder shall I resorte?  
Felawshyp here before with me wolde mery make,  
And nowe lytell sorowe for me dooth he take.  
It is sayd, in prosperyte men frendes may fynde,  
Whiche in adversyte be full unkynde.  
Now wheder [whither] for socoure shall I flee,  
Syth [since] that Felawshyp hath forsaken me?  
To my kynnesmen I wyll truely,  
Prayenge them to helpe me in my necessitye.  
I beleve that they wyll do so,  
For kynde wyll crepe where it may not go.<sup>31</sup>  
I wyll go saye; for yonder I se them go:—  
Where be ye now, my frendes and kynnesmen?<sup>32</sup>

## KYNREDE.

Here be we now at your commaundement.  
Cosyn, I praye you, shewe us your entent  
In ony wise, and not spare.<sup>33</sup>

## COSYN.

Ye, Everyman, and to us declare  
If ye be disposed to go ony whyder;  
For, wet you well wyll lyve and dye to gyder.<sup>34</sup>

[Kynrede

## KYNREDE.

In welth and wo we wyll with you holde; <sup>35</sup>  
 For over his kynne a man may be bolde.

## EVERYMAN.

Gramercy, my frendes and kynnesmen kynde,  
 Now shall I shewe you the grefe of my mynde.  
 I was commaunded by a messenger,  
 That is a hye kynges chefe offycer;  
 He bad me go a pylgrymage to my payne,  
 And, <sup>36</sup> I knowe well, I shall never come agayne.  
 Also I must gyve a rekenynge strayte,  
 For I have a grete enemy that hath me in wayte,  
 Whiche entendeth me for to hynder.

## KYNREDE.

What a counte is that whiche ye must render?  
 That wolde I knowe.

## EVERYMAN.

Of all my workes I must shewe,  
 How I have lyved, and my dayes spent;  
 Also of yll dedes that I have used  
 In my tyme, syth lyfe was me lent,  
 And of all vertues that I have refused.  
 Therefore, I praye you, go thyder with me  
 To helpe to make myn accounte, for saynt Charyte.  
[Cosyn

COSYN.

What, to go thyder? Is that the mater?  
Nay, Everyman, I had lever fast<sup>37</sup> brede and water,  
All this fyve yere and more.

EVERYMAN.

Alas, that ever I was bore!  
For now shall I never be mery,  
If that you forsake me.

KYNREDE.

A! syr, what, ye be a mery man!  
Take good herte to you, and make no mone.  
But one thyng I warne you, by saint Anne,  
As for me, ye shall go alone.

EVERYMAN.

My Cosyn, wyll you not with me go?

COSYN.

No, by our Lady! I have the crampe in my to:<sup>38</sup>  
Trust not to me; for, so God me spede,  
I wyll<sup>39</sup> deceyve you in your moost nede.

KYNREDE.

It avayleth not us to tyse [entice]:  
Ye shall have my mayde, with all my herte;  
She loveth to go to festes there to be nyse,  
And to daunce, and abroad to sterte.  
I wyll gyve her leve to helpe you in that journeye,  
If that you and she may agree.

[Everyman

EVERYMAN.

Now<sup>40</sup> shewe me the very effecte of your mynde  
Wyll you go with me, or abyde be hynde?

KYNREDE.

Abyde behynde! ye, that wyll I and I maye;  
Therefore farewell tyll another daye.

EVERYMAN.

Howe sholde I be mery or gladde?  
For fayre promyses men to me make,  
But, when I have moost nede, they me forsake;  
I am deceyved, that maketh me sadde.

COSYN.

Cosyn Everyman, farewell now,  
For, verily, I wyll not go with you.  
Also of myne owne<sup>41</sup> an unredy rekenynge  
I have to accounte, therefore I make taryenge;  
Now God kepe the, for now I go.

EVERYMAN.

A! Jesus, is all come hereto?  
Lo, fayre wordes maketh fooles fayne;<sup>42</sup>  
They promyse, and nothyng wyll do certayne.  
My kynnesmen promysed me faythfully  
For to abyde with me stedfastly;  
And now fast awaye do they flee:  
Even so Felawshyp promysed me.  
What frende were best me of to provyde?

[I lose

I lose my time here longer to abyde;  
Yet in my mynde a thyng there is:  
All my lyfe I have loved ryches;  
If that my Goodes now helpe me myght,  
He <sup>43</sup> wolde make my herte full light;  
I wyll speke to him in this distresse.  
Where arte thou, my Goodes and Ryches?

GOODES.

Who calleth me? Everyman? what, hast thou  
haste? <sup>44</sup>

I lye here in corners trussed and pyled so hye,  
And in chestes I am locked so fast,  
Also sacked in bagges, thou mayst se with thyn eye,  
I can not styre; in packes, lowe [low] I lye.  
What wolde ye have? Lightly me saye.

EVERYMAN.

Come hyder, Goodes, in al the haste thou may,  
For of counseyll I must desyre the.

GOODES.

Syr, and ye in the worlde have sorowe or adversyte,  
That can I helpe you to remedy shortly.

EVERYMAN.

It is another dysease that greveth me;  
In this world it is not, I tell the so,  
I am sent for an other way to go,  
To gyve a straye counte generall  
Before the hiest Jupiter of all.

[And

And all my lyfe I have had joye and pleasure in the,<sup>45</sup>  
 Therefore I pray the<sup>46</sup> go with me;  
 For, paraventure, thou mayst before God almyghty  
 My rekenynge helpe to clene and puryfye,  
 For it is saide ever amonge,  
 That money maketh all ryght that is wronge.

GOODES.

Nay, Everyman, I synge an other songe;  
 I folowe no man in suche vyages,  
 For, and I wente with the,  
 Thou sholdes fare moche the worse for me:  
 For because on me thou dyd set thy mynde,  
 Thy rekenynge I have made blotted and blynde,  
 That thyne accounte thou can not<sup>47</sup> make truely;  
 And that hast thou for the love of me.

EVERYMAN.

That wolde greve me full sore,  
 Whan I sholde come to that ferefull answer.  
 Up, let us go thyder togyder!

GOODES.

Nay, not so; I am to brytell, I may not endure:  
 I wyll folowe no man one fote, be ye sure.

EVERYMAN.

Alas! I have the loved, and had grete pleasure  
 All my lyfe dayes on good and treasure.

[Goodes

GOODES.

That is to thy dampnacyon without lesynge,<sup>48</sup>  
For my love is contrary to the love everlastynge;  
But yf thou had me loved moderately durynge,  
As to the poore gyve parte of me,<sup>49</sup>  
Than sholdest thou not in this dolour be,<sup>50</sup>  
Nor in this grete sorowe and care.

EVERYMAN.

Lo, now was I deceyved or <sup>51</sup> I was ware,  
And all I may wyte <sup>52</sup> myspendynge of tyme.

GOODES.

What, wenest [thinkest] thou I am thyne?

EVERYMAN.

I had went [thought] so.

GOODES.

Nay, Everyman, I saye no:  
'As for a whyle I was lente the;  
A season thou hast had me in prosperyte;  
My condycyon is mannes soule to kyll,  
If I save one, a thousande I do spyll.  
Wenest thou that I wyll folowe the?  
Nay, fro this world not veryle.<sup>53</sup>

EVERYMAN.

I had wende [thought] otherwyse.

[Goodes

GOODES.

Therefore to thy soul Good is a thefe,  
For whan thou arte deed, this is my gyse,  
Another to deceyve in the same wyse  
As I have done the, and all to his soules reprefe.

EVERYMAN.

O false Good, cursed thou be,  
Thou traytour to God that hast deceyved me  
And caught me in thy snare.

GOODES.

Mary [Marry], thou brought thy self in care,  
Wherof I am gladde:  
I must nedes laugh, I can not be sadde.

EVERYMAN.

A, Good, thou hast had longe my hertely [hearty]  
love;  
I gave the that whiche sholde be the Lordes above;  
But wylte thou not go with me in dede?  
I pray the trouth to say.

GOODES.

No, so God me spede!  
Therefore fare well and have good daye.

EVERYMAN.

O! to whome shall I make my mone  
For to go with me in that hevye journaye?

[Fyrst



Fyrst Felawshyp sayd he wolde with me gone;  
 His wordes were very plesaunt and gaye,  
 But afterwarde he lefte me alone.  
 Than spake I to my kynnesmen all in dyspayre,  
 And also they gave me wordes fayre;  
 They lacked no fayre spekyng,  
 But all forsake me in the endynge.  
 Then wente I to my Goodes that I loved best,  
 In hope to have comforte: but there had I leest,  
 For my Goodes sharpely dyd me tell  
 That he bryngeth many in to hell.  
 Than of my self I was ashamed,  
 And so I am worthy to be blamed:  
 Thus may I well my selfe hate.  
 Of whome shall I now counseyll take?  
 I thynke that I shall never spede  
 Tyll that I go to my Good Dedes;  
 But, alas! she is so weke  
 That she can nother go nor speke;  
 Yet wyll I venter on her now.  
 My Good Dedes, where be you?

## GOOD DEDES.

Here I lye colde in the grounde;  
 Thy synnes hath me sore bounde  
 That I can not stire [stir].

## EVERYMAN.

O Good Dedes, I stande in <sup>54</sup> fere.  
 I must you praye of counseyll,  
 For helpe now sholde come ryght well.

[Good Dedes

GOOD DEDES.

Everyman, I have understandynge  
 That ye be somoned a counte to make  
 Before Myssyas of Jherusalem kynge,  
 And you do by me that journey with you wyll I  
 take.<sup>55</sup>

EVERYMAN.

Therefore I come to you my mone to make,  
 I praye you that ye wyll go with me.

GOOD DEDES.

I wolde full fayne, but I can not stande verily.

EVERYMAN.

Why, is there ony thyng on you fall?

GOOD DEDES.

Ye, syr, I may thanke you of <sup>56</sup> all.  
 If ye had parfytely chered me,  
 Your boke of counte full redy nowe had be.  
 Loke, the bokes of your workes and dedes [deeds]  
 eke;  
 A! se <sup>57</sup> how they lye under the fete,  
 To your soules hevynes.

EVERYMAN.

Our Lorde Jesus helpe me,  
 For one letter here I can not se.

[Good Dedes]



“EVERYMAN, I WYLL GO WITH THE, AND BE THY GYDE.”



GOOD DEDES.

There is a blynde rekenynge in tyme of dystres!

EVERYMAN.

Good Dedes, I praye you helpe me in this nede,  
Or elles I am for ever dampned in dede;  
Therfore helpe me to make rekenynge  
Before the Redemer of all thynges,  
That kynge is, and was, and ever shall.

GOOD DEDES.

Everyman, I am sory of your fall,  
And fayne wolde I helpe you and I were able.

EVERYMAN.

Good Dedes, your counseyll, I praye you, gyve me.

GOOD DEDES.

That shall I do veryly;  
Thoughe that on my fete I may not go,  
I have a syster that shall with you also,  
Called Knowlege, whiche shall with you abyde,  
To helpe you to make that dredeful rekenynge.

KNOWLEGE.

Everyman, I wyll go with the, and be thy gyde  
In thy moost nede to go by thy syde.

[Everyman

EVERYMAN.

In good condycyon I am now in every thyng,  
 And am hole content with this good thyng,  
 Thanked be God my creator.

GOOD DEDES.

And whan he hath brought the there,  
 Where thou shalt hele the of thy smarte,  
 Than go thou with thy rekenynge and thy good dedes  
                   togyder,  
 For to make the joyfull at herte  
 Before the blessed Trynnye.

EVERYMAN.

My Good Dedes, gramercy ; <sup>58</sup>  
 I am well content certaynly  
 With your wordes swete.

KNOWLEGE.

Now go we togyder lovyngly  
 To Confessyon, that clensynge ryvere.

EVERYMAN.

For joy I wepe: I wolde we were there!  
 But, I pray you, gyve me cognycyon, <sup>59</sup>  
 Where dwelleth that holy man Confessyon?

KNOWLEGE.

In the hous of salvacyon ;  
 We shall fynde hym in that place,  
 That shall us comforte by Goddes grace.



“HERE SHALL YOU RECEIVE THAT SCOURGE OF ME”





Lo, this is Confessyon : knele downe, and aske mercy,  
For he is in good conceyte with God almyghty.

## EVERYMAN.

O glorious fountayne that all unclenenes doth  
claryfy,  
Wasshe fro me the spottes of vyce unclene,  
That on me no synne may be sene;  
I come with Knowlege for my redempcyon,  
Redempte with herte and full contrycyon,  
For I am commaunded a pylgrymage to take,  
And grete accountes before God to make.  
Now I pray you, Shryfte, moder of salvacyon,  
Helpe my good dedes for my pyteous exclamacyon.

## CONFESSYON.

I knowe your sorowe well, Everyman.  
Because with Knowlege ye come to me,  
I wyll you comforte as well as I can;  
And a precyous jewell I wyll gyve the,  
Called penaunce, voyce voyder<sup>60</sup> of adversyte;  
Therwith shall your body chastysed be  
With abstynence and perseveraunce in Goddes ser-  
vyce;  
Here shall you receyve that scourge of me  
Whiche is penaunce stronge that ye must endure,  
To remember thy Savyour was scourged for the  
With sharpe scourges, and suffred it pacyently;  
So must thou or [ere] thou scape that paynful pyl-  
grymage.

[Knowlege

Knowlege, kepe hym in this vyage,  
 And by that tyme Good Dedes wyll be with the;  
 But in ony wyse be seker [sure] of mercy,  
 For your tyme draweth fast and ye wyll saved be;  
 Aske God mercy, and he wyll graunte truely  
 Whan with the scourge of penaunce man doth hym  
                   bynde,  
 The oyle of forgyvenes than shall he fynde.

## EVERYMAN.

Thanked be God for his gracyous werke,  
 For nowe I wyll my penaunce begyn;  
 This hath rejoyced and lyghted my herte,  
 Though the knottes be paynful and harde within.

## KNOWLEGE.

Everyman, loke your penaunce that ye fulfyll,  
 What payne that ever it to you be;  
 And Knowlege<sup>61</sup> shall gyve you counseyll at wyll,  
 How your accounte ye shall make clerely.

## EVERYMAN.

O eternal God, o hevenly fygure,  
 O way of ryghtwysnes, o goodly vysyon,  
 Whych dyscended downe in a vyrgyne pure<sup>62</sup>  
 Because he wolde every man redeme,  
 Which Adam forfayted by his disobedyence;  
 O blessyd Godheed, electe and hye devyne,  
 Forgyve my grevous offence!  
 Here I crye the mercy in this presence:  
 O ghostly treasure, o raunsomer and redemer!

[Of all



"O ETERNAL GOD, O HEVENLY FYGURE."



Of all the worlde, hope and conduyter,<sup>63</sup>  
Myrrour of joye, foundatour [foundation] of mercy,  
Whiche enlumyneth heven and erth therby,  
Here my clamorous complaynt, though it late be!  
Receyve my prayers! unworthy in this hevy lyfe,<sup>64</sup>  
Though I be a synner most abhomynable,  
Yet let my name be wryten in Moyses table.  
O Mary, praye to the maker of all thyng  
Me for to helpe at my endyng,  
And save me fro the power of my enemy!  
For Dethe assayleth me strongly:  
And, Lady, that I may, by meane of thy prayer,  
Of your sones glory to be partynere,  
By the meanes of his passyon, I it crave;  
I beseche you, helpe my soule to save!  
Knowlege, gyve me the scourge of penaunce,  
My flesshe therwith shall gyve acqueyntance;<sup>65</sup>  
I wyll now begyn, yf God gyve me grace.

## KNOWLEGE.

Everyman, God gyve you tyme and space!  
Thus I bequeth you in the handes of our Savyour;  
Now may you make your rekenyng sure.

## EVERYMAN.

In the name of the holy Trynyte  
My body sore punyshed shall be,  
Take this body for the synne of the flesshe;  
Also thou delytest to go gay and freshe,  
And in the way of dampnacyon thou dyd me brynge;  
Therefore suffre now strokes of punysshynge;

[Now

Now of penaunce I wyll wade the water clere,  
To save me from purgatory, that sharpe fyre.<sup>66</sup>

GOOD DEDES.

I thanke God now I can walke and go,  
And am delyvered of my sykenesse and wo!  
Therefore with Everyman I wyll go, and not spare,  
His good workes I wyll helpe hym to declare.

KNOWLEGE.

Now, Everyman, be mery and glad,  
Your Good Dedes cometh now, ye may not be sad;  
Now is your Good Dedes hole and sounde,  
Goynge upryght upon the grounde.

EVERYMAN.

My herte is lyght and shall be evermore;  
Now wyll I smyte faster than I dyde before.

GOOD DEDES.

Everyman, pylgryme, my special frende,  
Blessyd be thou without ende;  
For the is preparate the eternale glorye.  
Ye have me made hole and sounde,  
Therefore I wyll byde by the in every stounde.<sup>67</sup>

EVERYMAN.

Welcome, my Good Dedes! Now I here thy voyce,  
I wepe for swetenes of love.

[Knowledge

## KNOWLEGE.

Be no more sad, but ever rejoyce,  
God seeth thy lyvyng in his trone above;  
Put on this garment to thy behove,  
Which is wette with your teres,  
Or elles<sup>68</sup> before God you may it mysse,  
When ye to your journeyes ende come shall.

## EVERYMAN.

Gentyll Knowlege, what do you yt call?

## KNOWLEGE.

It is the garment of sorowe,  
Fro payne it wyll you borowe;  
Contrycyon it is,  
That getteth forgyvenes,  
It pleaseth God passyng well.

## GOOD DEDES.

Everyman, wyll you were it for you hele [health]?

## EVERYMAN.

Now blessyd be Jesu, Maryes sone,  
For nowe have I on true contrycyon:  
And lette us go now without taryenge.  
Good Dedes, have we clere our rekenyng.

## GOODE DEDES.

Ye, in dede, I have them<sup>69</sup> here.

[Everyman

EVERYMAN.

Than I trust we nede not fere.  
Now, frendes, let us not parte in twayne.

KNOWLEGE.<sup>70</sup>

Nay, Everyman, that wyll we not certayne.

GOOD DEDES.

Yet must thou leade with the  
Thre persones of grete myght.

EVERYMAN.

Who sholde they be?

GOOD DEDES.

Dyscrecyon and Strengthe they hyght [are called],  
And thy Beaute may not abyde behynde.

KNOWLEGE.

Also ye must call to mynde  
Your Fyve Wyttes as for your counseylours.

GOOD DEDES.

You must have them ready at all houres.

EVERYMAN.

Howe shall I gette them hyder?

[Kynrede



## KYNREDE.

You must call them all togyder,  
And they wyll here you incontynent.<sup>71</sup>

## EVERYMAN.

My frendes, come hyder and be present,  
Dyscrecyon, Strengthe, my Fyve Wyttes<sup>72</sup> and  
Beaute.

## BEAUTE.

Here at your wyll we be all redy;  
What wyll ye that we shulde do?

## GOOD DEDES.

That ye wolde with Everyman go,  
'And helpe hym in his pylgrymage.  
Advyse you, wyll ye with hym or not in that vyage?

## STRENGTH.

We wyll brynge hym all thyder  
To his helpe and comforte,<sup>73</sup> ye may beleve me.

## DYSCRECYON.

So wyll we go with hym all togyder.

## EVERYMAN.

Almyghty God, loved myght thou be;  
I gyve the laude that I have hyder brought  
Strengthe, Dyscrecyon, Beaute, Fyve Wyttes, lacke  
I nought—

[And

And my Good Dedes, with Knowlege clere,  
 All be in my company at my wyll here;  
 I desyre no more to my besynes [business].<sup>74</sup>

## STRENGTH.

And I Strengthe wyll by you stande in dystres,  
 Though thou wolde in batayle fyght on the grounde.

## FIVE WYTTES.

And though it were thugh the worlde rounde,  
 We wyll not departe for swete ne soure.

## BEAUTE.

No more wyll I unto dethes houre,  
 Watsoever thereof befall.

## DYSCRECYON.

Everyman, advyse you fyrst of all,  
 Go with a good advysement and delyberacyon.  
 We all gyve you vertuous monycyon  
 That all shall be well.

## EVERYMAN.

My frendes, harken what I wyll tell;  
 I praye God rewarde you in his heven spere.  
 Now herken all that be here,  
 For I wyll make my testament  
 Here before you all present:

[In almes

In almes, halfe my good I wyll gyve with my handes  
twayne

In the way of charyte with good entent,  
And the other halfe styll shall remayne  
In queth to be retourned <sup>75</sup> there it ought to be.  
This I do in despyte of the fende of hell,  
To gon quyte out of his perell  
Ever after and this daye.

## KNOWLEGE.

Everyman, herken what I saye;  
Go to presthode, I you advyse,  
And receyve of him in ony wyse  
The holy sacrament and oyntement <sup>76</sup> togyder,  
Than shortly se ye tourne agayne hyder;  
We wyll all abyde you here.

## FIVE WYTTES.

Ye, Everyman, hye you that ye redy were.  
There is no emperour, kyng, duke, ne baron  
That of God hath commycyon,  
As hath the leest preest in the worlde beyng [being];  
For of the blessyd sacramentes pure and benygne  
[benign]

He bereth the keyes, and thereof hath the cure  
For mannes redempcyon, it is ever sure,  
Whiche God for our soules medycyne  
Gave us oute of his herte with grete payne,  
Here in this transytory lyfe for the and me.  
The blessyd sacramentes vii there be,

[Baptym]

Baptym, confyrmacyon, with preesthode good,  
And the sacrament of Goddes precyous flesshe and  
blood,

Maryage, the holy extreme unccyon, and penaunce;  
These seven be good to have in remembraunce,  
Gracyous sacramentes of hye devynyte.

EVERYMAN.

Fayne wolde I receyve that holy body,  
And mekely to my ghostly fader I wyll go.

FYVE WYTTES.

Everyman, that is the best that ye can do;  
God wyll you to salvacyon brynge,  
For preesthode excedeth all other thyng;  
To us holy scrypture they do teche,  
And converteth man fro synne heven to reche;  
God hath to them more power gyven  
Than to ony aungell that is in heaven.  
With v wordes he may consecrate  
Goddes body in flesshe and blode to make,<sup>77</sup>  
And handeleth his maker bytwene his handes;  
The preest byndeth and unbyndeth all bandes  
Bothe in erthe and in heven;  
Thou<sup>78</sup> mynystres all the sacramentes seven;  
Though we kysse thy fete thou were worthy,  
Thou art surgyon that cureth synne deedly;  
No remedy we fynde under God,  
But all onely preesthode.  
Everyman, God gave preestes that dygnyte,  
And setteth them in his stede amonge us to be;  
Thus be they above aungelles in degree.

[Knowlege

## KNOWLEGE.

If preestes be good it is so suerly,  
 But whan Jesu hanged on the crosse with grete  
     smarte,  
 There he gave out of his blessyd herte  
 The same sacrament in grete tourment;  
 He solde them not to us, that Lorde omnypotent;  
 Therfore saynt Peter the apostell dothe saye  
 That Jesus curse hath all they  
 Whiche God theyr Savyour do by [buy] or sell,  
 Or they for ony money do take or tell;  
 Synfull preestes gyveth the synners example bad;  
 Theyr chyldren sytteth by other mennes fyres, I have  
     harde,  
 And some haunteth womens company,  
 With unclene lyfe, as lustes of lechery;  
 These be with synne made blynde.

## FIVE WYTTES.

I trust to God no suche may we fynde;  
 Therfore let us preesthode honour,  
 And folowe theyr doctryne for our soules socoure.  
 We be theyr shepe, and they shepeherdes be,  
 By whome we all be kepte in suerte.  
 Peas! for yonder I see Everyman come,  
 Whiche hath made trewe satysfaccyon.

## GOOD DEDES.

Me thynke, it is he indede.

[Everyman

## EVERYMAN.

Now Jesu be our <sup>79</sup> alder spede! <sup>80</sup>  
 I have receyved the sacrament for my redempcyon,  
 And than myne extreme unccyon.  
 Blessyd be all they that counseyled me to take it!  
 And now, frendes, let us go without longer respyte;  
 I thanke God that ye have taryed so longe.  
 Now set eche of you on this rodde your honde,  
 And shortely folowe me:  
 I go before, there I wolde be: God be our gyde!

## STRENGTH.

Everyman, we wyll not fro you go,  
 Tyll ye have gone this vyage longe.

## DYSCRECYON.

I, Dyscrecyon, wyll byde by you also.

## KNOWLEGE.

And though this pylgrymage be never so stronge,  
 I wyll never parte you fro.  
 Everyman, I wyll be as sure by the  
 As ever I was by Judas Machabee.<sup>81</sup>

## EVERYMAN.

Alas! I am so faynt I may not stande,  
 My lymmes under me do folde.  
 Frendes, let us not tourne agayne to this lande,  
 Not for all the worldes golde,  
 For into this cave must I crepe,  
 And torne to the erthe and there slepe.<sup>82</sup>

[Beaute



“I GO BEFORE, THERE I WOLDE BE; GOD BE OUR GYDE!”





BEAUTE.

What, in to this grave? Alas!

EVERYMAN.

Ye, there shall ye consume more and lesse.<sup>83</sup>

BEAUTE.

And what, sholde I smoder here?

EVERYMAN.

Ye, by my fayth, and never more appere!  
In this worlde lyve no more we shall,  
But in heven before the hiest lorde of all.

BEAUTE.

I crosse out all this! adewe, by saynt Johan!  
I take<sup>84</sup> my cappe in my lappe, and am gone.

EVERYMAN.

What, Beaute! whyder wyll ye?

BEAUTE.

Peas! I am defe, I loke not behynd me,  
Not and thou woldest gyve me all the golde in thy  
chest.

EVERYMAN.

Alas! whereto may I truste?  
Beaute gothe fast awaye fro me,<sup>85</sup>  
She promysed with me to lyve and dye.

[Strengthe

STRENGTH.

Everyman, I wyll the also forsake and denye,  
Thy game lyketh me not at all.

EVERYMAN.

Why, than ye wyll forsake me all!  
Swete Strengthe, tary a lytel space.<sup>86</sup>

STRENGTH.

Nay, syr, by the rode of grace,  
I wyll hye me from the fast,  
Though thou wepe till thy hert do brast.

EVERYMAN.

Ye wolde ever byde by me, ye sayd.

STRENGTH.

Ye, I have you ferre ynoughe conveyde.  
Ye be olde ynoughe, I understande,  
Your pylgrymage to take on hande;  
I repent me that I hyder came.

EVERYMAN.

Strengthe, you to dysplease I am to blame;  
Wyll ye breke promyse that is dette?<sup>87</sup>

STRENGTH.

In fayth, as for that I care not!  
Thou art but a foole to complayne.  
You spende your spech, and waste your brayne;  
Go, thyrste [thrust] the into the grounde.

[Everyman

## EVERYMAN.

I had wende surer I sholde you have founde,  
But I se well, that trusteth in his Strengthe,  
She hym deceyveth<sup>88</sup> at the lengthe;  
Bothe Strength and Beaute forsaketh me,  
Yet they promysed me fayre and lovyngly.<sup>89</sup>

## DYSCRECYON.

Everyman, I wyll after Strength be gone;  
As for me, I wyll leve you alone.

## EVERYMAN.

Why, Dyscrecyon, wyll ye forsake me?

## DYSCRECYON.

Ye, in fayth, I wyll go fro the,  
For whan Strength goth before  
I folowe after ever more.

## EVERYMAN.

Yet, I pray the for love of the Trynyte,  
Loke in my grave ones pyteously.

## DYSCRECYON.

Nay, so nye wyll I not come!  
Now farewell fellowes everychone.

## EVERYMAN.

O, all thyng fayleth, save God alone:  
Beaute, Strengthe, and Dyscrecyon;  
For, whan Deth bloweth his blast,  
They all renne fro me full fast.

[Fyve Wyttes

## EVERYMAN

## FYVE WYTTES.

Everyman, my leve now of the I take;  
I wyll folowe the other, for here I the forsake.

## EVERYMAN.

Alas! than may I wayle and wepe,  
For I toke you for my best frende.

## FYVE WYTTES.

I wyll no lenger the kepe;  
Now farewell, and here an ende.

## EVERYMAN.

O Jesu, helpe! all hath forsaken me.

## GOOD DEDES.

Nay, Everyman, I wyll byde with the,  
I wyll not forsake the in dede;  
Thou shalte fynde me a good frende at nede.

## EVERYMAN.

Gramercy, Good Dedes, now may I true frendes se;  
They have forsaken me everychone;  
I loved them better than my Good Dedes alone;  
Knowlege, wyll ye forsake me also?

## KNOWLEGE.

Ye, Everyman, whan ye to deth shall go,  
But not yet for no maner of daunger.

[Everyman



“NAY, EVERYMAN, I WILL BYDE WITH THE.”



EVERYMAN.

Gramercy, Knowlege, with all my herte.

KNOWLEGE.

Nay, yet I wyll not from hens departe,  
Tyll I se where ye shall be come.

EVERYMAN.

Me thynke, alas! that I must be gone  
To make my rekenynge, and my dettes paye;  
For I se my tyme is nye spent away.  
Take example, all ye that this do here or se,  
How they that I love best do forsake me,  
Excepte my Good Dedes that bydeth truely.

GOOD DEDES.

All erthly thynges is but vanyte,  
Beaute, Strengthe, and Dyscrecyon do man forsake,  
Folysshe frendes and kynnesmen that fayre spake,  
All fleeth save Good Dedes, and that am I.

EVERYMAN.

Have mercy on me, God moost myghty,  
And stande by me, thou moder and mayde, holy Mary.

GOOD DEDES.

Fere not, I wyll speke for the.

EVERYMAN.

Here I crye, God mercy!

[Good Dedes

## GOOD DEDES.

Shorte our ende and mynyshe our payne;  
Let us go and never come agayne.

## EVERYMAN.

Into thy handes, Lorde, my soule I commende.  
Receyve it, Lorde, that it be not lost!  
As thou me boughtest, so me defende,  
And save me fro the fendes boost [fiend's boast]  
That I may appere with that blessyd hoost  
That shall be saved at the day of dome:  
*In manus tuas, of myghtes moost,*  
For ever *commendo spiritum meum.*<sup>90</sup>

## KNOWLEGE.

Now hath he suffred that we all shall endure,  
The good dedes shall make all sure.  
Now hath he made endynge,  
Me thynketh that I here aungelles synge,  
And make grete joy and melody,  
Where every mannes <sup>91</sup> soule receyved shall be.

## THE AUNGELL.

Come, excellent electe spouse to Jesu!  
Here above thou shalte go,  
Because of thy synguler vertue.  
Now thy soule is taken thy body fro,  
Thy rekenynge is crystall clere;  
Now shalte thou into the heavenly spere,  
Unto the whiche all ye shall come  
That lyveth well, before the daye of dome

[Doctour



## DOCTOUR.

This morall men <sup>92</sup> may have in mynde:  
Ye herers, take it of <sup>93</sup> worth, olde and yonge,  
And forsake pryde, for he deceyveth you in the ende,  
And remember Beaute, Fyve Wyttes, Strengthe, and  
Dyscrecyon.

They all at the last do Everyman forsake,  
Save his Good Dedes, there doth he take.<sup>94</sup>  
But beware, and they be small,  
Before God he hath no helpe at all;  
None excuse may be there for Everyman.  
Alas! howe shall he do than?  
For after dethe amendes may no man make,  
For than mercy and pyte doth hym forsake;  
If his rekenynge be not clere whan he doth come,  
God wyll saye *Ite, maledicti, in ignem æternum*.  
And he that hath his accounte hole and sounde—  
Hye in heven he shall be crounde,  
Unto whiche place God bringe us all thyder,  
That we may lyve body and soule togyder!  
Therto helpe the Trynyte!  
Amen, saye ye, for saynt Charyte.

## F I N I S

Thus endeth this morall playe of Everyman.<sup>95</sup>



## APPENDIX



## NOTES TO INTRODUCTION

1. An example of the *trope* is well illustrated in the following which is taken from Gautier's *Hist. de la Poésie Liturg. au Moyen Âge. Les Tropes* [pp. 2-3]. The *Introit to the Mass of Christmas Morning* reads (Roman Liturgy):

Puer natus est nobis, et filius datus est nobis, cujus imperium super humerum ejus, et vocabitur nomen ejus magni consilii angelus (Isaiah ix. 6).

In *trope*: Gaudeamus hodie quia Deus descendit de cœlis, et propter nos in terris *Puer natus est nobis*, quem Prophetæ diu vaticinati sunt. *Et filius datus est nobis*. Hunc a Patre jam novimus advenisse in mundum *Cujus imperium super humerum ejus*, potestas et regnum in manu ejus. *Et vocabitur nomen ejus* Admirabilis, consiliarius, Deus fortis, princeps pacis, *magni consilii angelus*.

The relation, however, between the *trope* and the later liturgical and passion plays is a difficult, yet an important, one to establish.

2. In *Das Drama des Mittelalters*, R. Froning, appear examples of this change to the vernacular, in the German development. From the *Trier Easter Play*, the following is quoted (*vide* vol. i, p. 51, ll. 50-53):

Tunc angeli cantant:

Quem queritis, O tremule mulieres, in hoc tumultu  
plorantes?

Et primus angelus dicit rickmum:

Wenen sucht ir drij frauwen  
myd jamer un myt ruwen  
also frue inn dyessem grabe  
an dyssem osterlychen tage?

Note the translation is fairly close, with but a slight idea added.

From the *Benediktbeur Passion Play*, the earliest Passion play extant (end of XIIIth century, or beginning of XIVth century), the following is quoted (*vide* p. 286, ll. 27-30; 35-41):

Modo vadat Maria cum puellis ad mercatorem cantando:

Michi confer, venditor, species emendas  
pro multa pecunia tibi iam reddenda!  
si quid habes insuper ordoramentorum:  
nam volo perungere corpus hoc decorum. . . .

Maria Magdalena:

Chrumer, gip die varwe mier,  
diu min wengel roete,  
da mit ich di jungen man  
an ir danch der minnenliebe noete!

Item:

Seht mich an,  
jungen man!  
Lat mich eu gevallen!

Note the free translation, lyrical style, and popular quality. There are two more stanzas in a similar strain.

3. We quote from Mr. Charles Davidson's invaluable monograph on the *English Mystery Plays* (Yale Univ., 1892) concerning the *pays*:

“In France, the *puy*, that shadowy literary academy of the Middle Ages, was the immediate successor of the clergy. These *puy*s, semi-religious, semi-literary, were very numerous in the west and north of France. During the XIth and XIIth centuries they were devoted to the service of the Virgin, and the members composed verse in her honor, but in the XIIIth century the influence of the lay members led to a broader literary life, and they cultivated zealously the religious drama. To some *puy* the cycle of Notre-Dame is attributed. In the Puy d’Arras, it is believed, the comedies of Adam de la Halle were played. These literary societies, about the XVth century, turned to other lines of literary activity, to Moralities, farces, chansons, chants, royaux, etc., the Mystery falling to the various societies of confrères, of which the Confrères de la Passion, of Paris, was the most famous.”

4. The development of the drama in Germany is not here considered at length, since the limits and scope of the Introduction would not allow it. The French period of transition, being a typical one and directly influencing the English, must necessarily be treated, since without it, the English Mysteries would appear isolated, and as a growth peculiar to English soil. The reader will see that the Anglo-Norman combine did much to establish the English religious drama. However, Germany is rich in material, and has been worked up by authorities mentioned in the bibliography.

5. *Théophile* sells his soul to Satan, and finally

repents and is saved; the play thus had a strong theological motive for those who witnessed it. An analogy is traced in Goethe's *Faust*.

6. Some idea of the length of the French Mysteries may be obtained from the following list, based upon De Julleville:

*Saint Etienne*—346 verses (only a fragment).

*Acts of Apostles*—61,908 verses.

*Old Testament*—50,000 verses.

*New Testament*—180,000 verses.

7. Professor Edwin R. A. Seligman (*Med. Gilds of Eng.*) thus describes the duties of the Gild Merchant:

“It was instituted solely for the purpose of securing exemptions from commercial burdens and enjoying a practical monopoly of municipal trade. It possessed property, enjoyed the privilege of self-government, often formed conventions with the gild of a neighboring town to afford reciprocal rights of free entry and exit, was not without a certain jurisdiction, although always subordinate to the court leet, and often attained sufficient importance to become, to a limited extent, an integral part of the civic administration [through its members belonging to civic organizations].”

The craft gilds represented the laboring rather than the merchant class. The members of a particular trade united, writes Professor Seligman, not for political protection, but to obtain economic advantages and supervision of its members; to prevent individuals from gaining unfair advantage



over others. It was not developed from the Gild Merchant; it rarely opposed the Gild Merchant. A craftsman could become a member of this higher body.

8. It must not be inferred that the four cycles here mentioned represent the extent of the Mystery play in England. In the Appendix to *The English Religious Drama*, Katharine Lee Bates gives a summary of the plays, showing that at one time there existed cycles in London, Worcester, and Beverley; besides the four principal cycles treated of in the Introduction, there are also extant plays from Cornwall, Dublin, Newcastle-on-Tyne, Norfolk, Norwich, and Digby. See also E. K. Chambers' *The Mediæval Stage*, vol. ii., Appendix X., p. 407 *seq.*

9. The following is quoted from a letter written by the husband of Edith Wynne Matthison—Charles Rann Kennedy, Esquire—outlining the method by which his wife arrived at her perfect interpretation of the rôle of *Everyman*. The editor wishes to acknowledge his indebtedness to Mr. Kennedy for the privilege of quoting it, and for his interest throughout the preparation of this edition:

“The costumes, scenery, accessories, and the general scheme of the ‘business’ of *Everyman* were solely due to Mr. William Poel, the founder of the Elizabethan Stage Society of England, but to Mrs. Kennedy is due everything that translates the part into a living reality—not only those little subtleties of ‘business’ and stage-movement that make her performance a model of dramatic technique, but also that deep psychological under-

standing, and that spiritual exaltation which give it unity, consistence, and 'grip'! In the purely psychological analysis of the play, I suppose I must say that she was partly indebted to myself—to four lectures that I delivered in London at Mr. Poel's request, when he first produced the play there.

"The main points in this analysis took regard (first), of the increasingly narrowing rings of objective influence to which *Everyman* makes appeal for company on his long journey: commencing with *Fellowship*—the outermost ring of all—he finally appeals to *Goods*—of all the *objectives* (so to speak) of the soul, the term nearest. Then (secondly) the subjective analysis begins, and this also is worked out relentlessly, until finally only the naked soul itself returns to its God, the *Good Deeds* following after.

"Again, another thread in the symbolism of the story we discovered in the fact that *Everyman*, up to the point of penance, seems to be merely man in the single, personal, you-and-I sense of the word; but after that point he takes on a double symbolism typifying Christ, the 'All-man'; following out which hint, my wife converted (mentally) the great prayer into the agony of Gethsemane, the procession into the way of the Cross, the failure of the soul's outermost functions into the denial of Peter and the forsaking of the disciples, and so forth. Moreover, I should like to say, too, that it matters little whether the *audience* directly or intellectually perceives my wife's intention in these

points; but it means practically everything that *she* should perceive it—else the true unity and consistency of the part were impossible.

“We understood *Knowledge* to represent practically the Church—the Bride of Christ *in Herself* as distinct from the Church *in function*—as symbolized through *Confession*: a mediæval distinction which I think is worth noticing; *Knowledge* here, of course, meaning *divine knowledge* (the Church being the depository thereof) as distinct from *Discretion*—the mere discerning, separating, intellectual faculty—who fails finally with the rest. . . .

“The order in which the four abstractions fade away is interesting—and my wife tries to convey their import by her acting: *Beauty* first—the outermost expression of the soul; then *Strength*, which underlies and quickens *Beauty*; next *Discretion*—that which, among other functions, directs *Strength*, and lastly the five metaphysical wits, or what one may call the instincts of *Discretion*. Then the soul itself is left free.”

## NOTES TO EVERYMAN

[I have to acknowledge my indebtedness, in editing the text of *Everyman*, to Mr. Alfred Pollard, whose notes in his edition of *English Miracle Plays* proved of great value; to Hawkins, who, in his *The Origin of the English Drama*, made some text changes that have been noted; and to Hazlitt's edition of Dodsley's *Old English Plays* (vol. i).

May I add further my appreciation of the helpful suggestions received from Professor Brander Matthews, of Columbia University; from Dr. Horace Howard Furness, editor of the *Variorum Shakespeare*; from Rev. Joseph H. McMahon, director of the New York Cathedral Library; and from Mr. Ben Greet, whose artistic insight did much to make the presentation of *Everyman* an established fact. I also wish to acknowledge the courtesies that have been extended to me by the Libraries of Columbia and Harvard Universities.

I here desire to express my deep appreciation of the exquisite work of Mrs. Charles Rann Kennedy (Edith Wynne Matthison) in her re-creation of the rôle of *Everyman*. It was marked by the rich quality of her reading and by the refined intensity of her spiritual passion. Of her it might be said that in voice and gesture she would have found the rare, keen praise of Lamb.

In editing the text, I have considered carefully the corrections made by the different editors before me, and have adopted those changes I thought consistent. In the following notes I have called attention to important text differences that have peculiar interest in themselves. The abbreviations D., H., and P., wherever they occur, stand respectively for Dodsley, Hawkins, and Pollard. The present editor is alone responsible for decisions as to changes in readings and punctuations.]

1. A cut of *Everyman* and *Dethe* follows this in the old editions. It may be found in Hawkin's *The Origin of the English Drama*, and in Dodsley's *Old English Plays*. In Dodsley are likewise given cuts of other characters in the play.
2. The *Dramatis Personæ* are given in the order in which appearance in play is made.
3. The *Messenger* is the same character as the *Doctor* of the epilogue.
4. Skot reads *wonderous*.
5. Although the capital letter J was not introduced until A. D. 1630, it has been used throughout the text to avoid confusion.
6. Certain lines would lead one to believe Christ the Speaker; Hawkins and Percy think so. But the general spirit of the speech indicates the Father. Dodsley (Hazlitt) thinks the Father is meant.
7. *ghostly*: *vid. ghoste*: *spirit*.
8. *appayreth*: *impaireth*, *grow worse* (D).

9. *renne*: *run*.
10. *heven kynge*: *heaven's king* (D).
11. Pollard gives *asketh*.
12. Pollard calls attention to Lincoln ed., which in place of *ado* writes *I do*; Hawkins follows Lincoln; Dodsley does not.
13. *reste*: *arrest*; D. prints *'rrest*.
14. Dodsley inserts *thou*.
15. *in no way can this be*.
16. *seke*: *sick*.
17. Dodsley inserts *for* editorially.
18. *And could I have xii years respite*.
19. The touch in this line is characteristically medieval.
20. *be gete*: *been born*, or *been begotten*.
21. *What though I should to Fellowship thereof speak*.
22. *If any have wronged you*.
23. The line is short, whereas *account* would seem consistent.
24. *Adonay*: Hebrew for *Lord God*.
25. *sothe*: *sooth*.
26. The text might read *Felawshyp*; Dodsley edits *fellows(hip)*.
27. *To bringe me forward* reads *to escort me* (P).
28. Pollard reads *thou* for *you*.
29. It is thought by some that this should be *endynge* to rime with the following line.
30. With this line, so Dodsley notes, Pynson's edition begins abruptly, the rest of the text being given in full.
31. Proverbial expression.

32. In this line the rime is broken; should there be a rime ending? Dodsley adds *lo*.
33. Dodsley reads *do not spare*.
34. With additions, this line is interpreted by Dodsley as follows: *We will live and die together*.
35. Hawkins would transpose the rimes *holde* and *bolde*. Context would not justify this change.
36. Dodsley reads *but*.
37. *on* understood.
38. Medieval humor largely reached through bodily discomfort.
39. Skot, according to Hawkins, reads *I will not*. Dodsley does not agree.
40. Dodsley reads *No* in place of *Now*.
41. Dodsley inserts *life*, to which the text points.
42. Proverbial expression.
43. In place of *he* Dodsley reads *it*.
44. *Why, do you hasten?*
45. Dodsley reads *I have had my pleasure in thee*.
46. Insertion of *now* by D.
47. Pollard has a seemingly arbitrary way of spelling *not*; sometimes *nat*. I have adopted the uniform *not*.
48. *lesynge*: *loosing, releasing; inevitably* (Farmer).
49. Dodsley reads *for the love of me*.
50. Dodsley reads *have be*.
51. *or* has the force of *before*; Dodsley reads *ere*.
52. *wyte*: *blame* (Sidgwick).
53. Dodsley reads *Nay, not fro this world*.
54. Pollard and Dodsley both insert *great*.

55. Pollard reads *And you do by me the journey with you wyll I take*. He further interprets the first part of the line as meaning: *If you will act by my advice*. Dodsley agrees with above. Hawkins reads *what*.
56. *Of* has the force of *for*.
57. Instead of *A! se*, Dodsley reads *Behold*.
58. Dodsley reads *I thank thee heartfully*.
59. Dodsley reads *I pray you to instruct me by intellection (information, knowledge)*.
60. Dodsley simply has *voider*.
61. Dodsley makes a consistent change to pronoun *I*, since *Knowlege* is talking; I leave the name, since it lends the tone of abstractness that makes the play a *Morality*.
62. A typical line of the Miracle plays; as likewise the two lines following.
63. *conduyter: conductor*.
64. Dodsley prints this line: *prayers of thy benig-nity*.
65. Dodsley reads *Acquittance*.
66. Dodsley says Skot reads *from hell and from the fire*.
67. *stounde: hour, season*; Farmer reads *sub sorrow, adversity*.
68. In place of *or elles*, Dodsley reads *lest*. Further he reads *Lest before God it be unsweet*.
69. Pollard gives *them*, meaning the indications in *Everyman's* book. In Mr. Greet's production, *Everyman's* "rekenynge boke" is in evidence.
70. I follow Pollard, in assigning this speech to *Knowlege*. *Kynrede*, to whom H. assigns it, left with *Cosyn* some time before.



71. *incontynent: incontinent.*

72. A note, taken from Hawkins, reads as follows:

“Five wyttes, i. e., the Five Senses. These are frequently exhibited as five distinct personages upon the Spanish stage (see Riccoboni, p. 98) but our moralist has represented them all by one character. In Shakespeare’s ‘King Lear,’ the *Madman* says: ‘Bless thy five wits!’ meaning the Five Senses.” (Percy) Dodsley quotes this also. Thomas Percy, D. D. (*Reliq. Ancient Eng. Poetry*), writes: “. . . It may be observed that ‘*Everyman*’ is a grave, solemn piece, not without some rude attempts to excite terror and pity, and therefore may not improperly be referred to the class of tragedy. It is remarkable that in this old simple drama the fable is conducted upon the strictest model of the Greek tragedy. The action is simply one, the time of action is that of the performance, the scene is never changed, nor the stage ever empty. *Everyman*, the hero of the piece, after his first appearance, never withdraws, except when he goes out to receive the sacraments, which could not well be exhibited in public, and during his absence *Knowledge* descants on the excellence and power of the priesthood, somewhat after the manner of the Greek chorus. And, indeed, except in the circumstance of *Everyman*’s expiring on the stage, the ‘*Samson Agonistes*’ of Milton is hardly formed on a severer plan.”

73. Dodsley reads *To help and comfort him*.
74. This note is given by Dodsley: "This portion has been collated with the Douce fragment printed by Pynson (Shakespeare Society Papers, III, 149), as well as with the other impression by Pynson in the British Museum."
75. Dodsley reads *I it bequeath to be returned*.  
*There* following would indicate *where*.
76. *oyntement: unction* (D).
77. Dodsley reads *take*.
78. *Thou* refers to *preest*; Dodsley gives *those*, which is not consistent. The context could justify the use of pronoun *he* in lines following, instead of the direct address as given in Hawkins. Some editions give *He*.
79. Skot gives *your*; so does H. This does not seem to be consistent, so I leave *our*.
80. Dodsley reads *Now Jesus Christ be your alder speed*. Hawkins omits word *Christ*.
81. Skot gives *dyde*. Pollard refers to *I. Macc.* iii. 3, 4.
82. Skot reads *And tourne to erth and there to slepe*. This line is assigned to *Beaute* by Dodsley, and the assignments of lines following are generally mixed. I have followed the sense of the text.
83. Instead of *ye consume* Pollard reads *we consume* and interprets *more and lesse* as meaning *great people and little*.
84. *Take*, meaning *doff*.
85. Dodsley reads *Beaute doth fast away hie*.

86. Pynson and Dodsley both read *Strength, tary, I pray you.*
87. The line as it stands is Skot's; Pollard and Dodsley suggest for sake of rime the following for the proverbial expression: *Yet promyse is dette, this ye well wot.*
88. Pynson and Dodsley read *Is greatly deceived.*
89. For rime, Pynson and Dodsley read *Stedfast to be*; Pollard also.
90. Dodsley reads *Everyman dies.*
91. Dodsley makes this a special reference to *Everyman.*
92. Dodsley reads *This memory all men.*
93. *of* has the force of *for what it is worth.*
94. Dodsley edits: *(them he) there doth take.*
95. Two interesting imprints follow the different manuscripts, and read:  
     Imprynted at London in Poules chyrche yarde  
     by me John Skot.  
     Imprynted at London in Flete Strete || by me  
     Rycharde Pynson || prynter to the kynges  
     moost noble grace.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

[The following bibliography is not intended to be exhaustive; it gives a few works covering the different periods surveyed in the Introduction. In many of the books mentioned there are to be found more comprehensive bibliographies for the student who wishes to continue the subject further.]

### THE CHURCH

ALT, HEINRICH—

Theatre und Kirche in Ihrem Gegenseitigen Verhältniss Historisch Dargestellt. (Berlin, 1846)

BIBLIOTHÈQUE DE L'ÉCOLE DES CHARTES—

Le Clergé Normand au XIII<sup>e</sup> Siècle. (1846-7, p. 479)

FISHER, GEORGE PARK—

History of the Christian Church. (N. Y., 1887)

LECOY DE LA MARCHE, RICHARD ALBERT—

La Chaire Française au Moyen Âge, spécialement au XIII<sup>e</sup> Siècle d'après les Manuscrits Contemporains. (Paris, 1886)

MILMAN, HENRY HART—

History of Christianity [bk. iv; vol. iii; ch. i]. (London, 1863)

SCHAFF, PHILIP—

History of the Christian Church, from the Birth of Christ to the Reign of Constantine. (N. Y., 1859)

## FRENCH PERIOD.

CLEDAT, LÉON—

Rutebeuf [Les Grands Écrivains Français].  
(Paris, 1898)

COUSSEMAKER, CHARLES EDMOND HENRI—

L'Art Harmonique aux XII<sup>e</sup> et XIII<sup>e</sup> Siècles.  
(Paris, 1865)

——Drames Liturgiques du Moyen Âge. (Rennes, 1860)

DU MÉRIL, ÉDÉLSTAND PONTAS—

Les Origines Latines du Théâtre Moderne.  
(Paris, 1897)

GAUTIER, LÉON—

Histoire de la Poésie Liturgique au Moyen Âge:  
Les Tropes. (Paris, 1886)

JOURNAL DES SAVANTS—

Magnin, C.—*vide* vols. for 1860, 1861.

JULLEVILLE, LOUIS PETIT DE—

Histoire du Théâtre en France au Moyen Âge:  
Les Mystères. [2 vols.] (Paris, 1880)

——Histoire de la Langue et de la Littérature  
Française des Origines à 1900. [7 vols.]  
(Paris, 1896-99)

LA RUE, M. L'ABBE DE—

Essais Historiques sur les Bardes, les Jongleurs,  
et les Trouvères. (Caen, 1834)

LAUN, HENRI VAN—

History of French Literature. [3 vols] (N. Y.,  
1876)

LAVISSE, ERNEST, ET RAMBAUD, A. N.—

Histoire Générale du IV<sup>e</sup> Siècle à Nos Jour.  
[vol. ii] (Paris, 1893 *seq.*)

LEROY, JEAN BAPTISTE ONÉSIME—

Études sur les Mystères. (Paris, 1837)

LITTRÉ, MAXIMILIEN PAUL ÉMILE—

Études sur les Barbares et le Moyen Âge.  
(Paris, 1861)

LUCHAIRE, ACHILLE—

Manuel des Institutions Françaises, Période des  
Capétiens Directs. (Paris, 1892)

MAGNIN, CHARLES—

Les Origines du Théâtre Antique et du Théâtre  
Moderne; ou, Histoire du Génie Dramatique  
depuis le I<sup>er</sup> jusqu'au XVI<sup>e</sup> Siècle. (Paris, 1868)  
———*Vide* Journal des Savants.

MONMERQUÉ ET MICHEL—

Théâtre Français au Moyen Âge [XI<sup>e</sup>-XIV<sup>e</sup>  
siècle.] (Paris, 1879)

PARIS, GASTON BRUNO PAULIN—

La Littérature Française au Moyen Âge. [XI<sup>e</sup>-  
XIV<sup>e</sup> siècles.] (Paris, 1888)

RAYNAUD, GASTON—

Recueil de Motets Français des XII<sup>e</sup> et XIII<sup>e</sup>  
Siècles. [Vol. ii]

ROY, ÉMILE—

Études sur le Théâtre Français du XIV<sup>e</sup> et du  
XV<sup>e</sup> Siècles . . . . Les Miracles de Notre-  
Dame. (Paris, 1902) [This was followed by  
a second study, "Le Jour du Jugement." Paris,  
1902.]

———Le Jour du Jugement: Mystère Français  
sur le Grand Schisme. [Étude sur le Théâtre  
Français au XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle.] (Paris, 1902)

ROY, ÉMILE—

Les Mystères de la Passion en France du XIV<sup>e</sup> au XVI<sup>e</sup> Siècle (Revue Bourguignonne-Université de Dijon. 1903, vol. 13, nos. 3-4) [In the second part, vol. 14, 1904, nos. 3-4, the author considers "La Théologie et le Développement du Mystère de la Passion au XV<sup>e</sup> siècle."]

SEPET, MARIUS CYRILLE ALPHONSE—

Le Drame Chrétien au Moyen Âge. (Paris, 1878)

— — Les Prophètes du Christ. Étude sur les Origines du Théâtre au Moyen Âge. (*vide* Bibliothèque de l'école des Chartes. Series 6, vols. iii, iv,—1867, 1868)

— — Les Plus Anciens Drames en Langue Française. (Paris, 1894)

SYMME, H. S.—

Les Débuts de la Critique Dramatique en Angleterre. (1893)

[To quote Professor Schelling: ". . . valuable material concerning the attitude of the clergy towards the drama."]

TIVIER, HENRI—

Histoire de la Littérature Dramatique en France depuis ses Origines jusqu'au Cid. (Paris, 1873)

VITRY, JACQUES DE—

Exempla, or Illustrative Stories from the *Sermones Vulgares*. (Folk Lore Soc. Pub.—ed. Crane.)

WALLON, HENRI ALEXANDRE—

Saint Louis et Son Temps. (Paris, 1876)

WILMOTTE, M.—

La Naissance de l'Élément Comique dans le Théâtre Religieux. (In *Congrès internationales d'histoire comparée*, 1900. *Annales internationales d'histoire*, 1901, vol. vi, pp. 49-69)

——Les Origines du Drame Liturgique. (*Acad. Roy. de Belg. Bulletin de la classe des lettres*, pp. 715-748, Bruxelles, 1901)

### GERMAN PERIOD.

BRANDL, A.—

Quellen des weltlichen Dramas in England vor Shakespeare. [Quellen und Forschungen, lxxx] (1898)

CREIZENACH, WILHELM—

Geschichte des neueren Dramas (Halle A. S. verlag von Max Niemeyer) [vol. i—Mittelalter und Frührenaissance (1893); vol. ii—Renaissance und Reformation (1901); vol. iii—Renaissance und Reformation (1903)]

FRANCKE, KUNO—

History of German Literature as Determined by Social Forces. (N. Y., 1901)

FRONING, RICHARD—

Das Drama des Mittelalters. Erster Teil. Die Lateinischen Osterfeiern in Deutschland. Ostertspiele; Passionspiele. (Stuttgart, 1891)

KLEIN, J. L.—

Geschichte des Dramas. [13 vols.] (Leipzig, 1865-76.) [Vol. ii—Das Drama der Römer; vol. iii—Das aussereuropäische Drama und die latein. Schauspiele n. Chr. bis Ende d. X.



Jahrhunderts; vols. xii, xiii—Das Englische Drama.]

LANGE, CARL—

Die Lateinischen Osterfeiern: Untersuchungen über den Ursprung und die Entwicklung der Liturgisch - dramatischen Auferstehungsfeier. (München, 1887)

MILCHSACK, GUSTAV—

Die Oster- und Passionspiele: [vol. i.] Die Lateinischen Osterfeiern. (Wolfenbüttel, 1880)

MONE, FRANZ JOSEPH—

Schauspiele des Mittelalters. [2 Bde.] (Karlsruhe, 1846)

PRÖLSS, KARL ROBERT—

Geschichte des Neueren Dramas. [3 vols.] (Leipzig, 1880, 1881, 1883)

WILMOTTE, MAURICE—

Les Passions Allemandes du Rhin, dans leur Rapport avec l'Ancien Théâtre Français. [Acad. Roy. de Belgique, Mém. vol. lv, no. 10] (Brussels, 1896-98)

WIRTH, LUDWIG—

Die Oster- und Passionspiele bis zum XVI Jahrhundert Beiträge zur Geschichte des Deutschen Dramas.

## ENGLISH PERIOD.

ASHLEY, WILLIAM JAMES—

Introduction to English Economic History and Theory. (London, 1888-93)

———Beginnings of Town Life in the Middle Ages. (*Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 1896, vol. x, p. 359)

BATES, KATHARINE LEE—

The English Religious Drama. (N. Y., 1893)

———English Drama: A Working Basis. (Wellesley College, 1896.—Bibliography)

BATESON, MARY—

Mediæval England: English Feudal Society from the Norman Conquest to the middle of the Fourteenth Century. [*The Story of the Nations* series.] (Putnam, 1904)

———The Mediæval Stage. (*Scottish Historical Review*, vol. i, pp. 399-406. Glasgow, July, 1904)

———The Charters of the Borough of Cambridge [ed. F. W. Maitland and Mary Bateson.]. (Cambridge, 1901)

CHAMBERS, E. K.—

The Mediæval Stage. [2 vols.] (Oxford, 1903.)  
[This is one of the most exhaustive treatments of the subject published in English. List of Authorities, vol. i, pp. xiii-xlii. Complete records and lists in Appendices, vol. ii, pp. 229-461]

COLLIER, JOHN PAYNE—

History of English Dramatic Poetry to the Time of Shakespeare. (London, 1831)

DAVIDSON, CHARLES—

Studies in the English Mystery Plays. (Yale University, 1892)

FLEAY, F. G.—

A Chronicle History of the London Stage, 1559-1642. (1890)

GAYLEY, CHARLES MILLS—

The Star of Bethlehem: A Miracle Play of the Nativity, reconstructed from the Towneley and other old English Cycles (of the XIIIth, XIVth, and XVth Centuries), and Supplemented and Adapted to Modern Conditions, as Composed for Mr. Ben Greet, and Presented by his Company. (Fox, Duffield, 1904) [With an introduction and wood-cuts; in the same form as same publisher's modernized version of "Everyman."]

——Representative English Comedies. (Macmillan, 1903.) [Introductory Essay: An Historical View of the Beginnings of English Comedy, pp. xiii-xcii.]

——Plays of Our Forefathers: and some of the traditions upon which they were founded. (Duffield, 1907) [A more popular treatment than that by Chambers; excellent illustrations.]

——The Earlier Miracle Plays in England. [*The International Quarterly*, vol. x, Oct., 1904, pp. 108-129]

——The Later Miracle Plays of England. [*The International Quarterly*, vol. xii, Oct., 1905, pp. 67-88]

GOEDEKE, KARL—

Everyman, Homulus, und Hekastus. (Hanover, 1865.) [Containing text]

GROSS, CHARLES—

The Gild Merchant. (Oxford, 1890)

HIBBERT, FRANCIS AIDAN—

Influence and Development of English Gilds, as Illustrated by the History of the Craft Gilds of Shrewsbury. (Cambridge, Eng., 1891)

HONE, W.—

Ancient Mysteries described, especially the English Miracle Plays founded on Apocryphal New Testament Story. (London, 1823)

JUSSERAND, J. J.—

Le Théâtre en Angleterre depuis la Conquête jusqu'aux Prédecesseurs Immédiats de Shakespeare. (Paris, 1881.) [See Chap. ii—Les Mystères; Chap. iii—Les Moralités]

— —A Note on Pageants and 'Scaffolds Hye.' [xxiii—In "An English Miscellany presented to Dr. Furnivall." Oxford, 1901]

— —A Literary History of the English People. [2 vols. issued; still in course of publication. Vol. i, chap. vi, The Theatre: Origins—Civil Sources; Religious Sources; Literary and Historical value of Mysteries; Decay of the Mediæval Stage.] (Putnam, 1895, 1896) See also the same author's "English Wayfaring life in the Middle Ages."

KLEIN, DAVID—

A Contribution to a Bibliography of the Mediæval Drama. (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, xx, 1905, Nov., pp. 202-205)

LANIER, SIDNEY—

Shakspeare and His Forerunners: Studies in

Elizabethan Poetry and Its Development from Early English. [2 vols.] (Doubleday, Page, 1902.) [Sumptuous in form and illustration]

MANLY, J. M.—

Specimens of the Pre-Shakspearean Drama. [With introduction, notes, and glossary.] (3 vols, 1897)

MANTZIUS, KARL—

A History of Theatrical Art in Ancient and Modern Times. [Translated by Louise von Cossel; *vide* Greek Theatre, Roman Theatre, Ecclesiastical Plays, Secular Plays. A four volume work of value, with bibliographies.] (London, 1903, 1904, 1905)

MATTHEWS, BRANDER—

The Development of the Drama. (Scribner, 1903.) [The chapter on "The Mediæval Drama" appeared originally in *Mod. Philol.*, June, 1903.]

MEYER, DR. HEINRICH—

The Infancy of the English Drama. (Hagen, 1873)

MOORE, E. HAMILTON—

English Miracle Plays and Moralities. (London, 1907)

MORLEY, HENRY—

English Writers. [vols, ii, iii (Hilarius), iv.] (London, 1899)

POLLARD, ALFRED W.—

English Miracle Plays, Moralities, and Interludes [Introduction and Notes]. (Clarendon Press, 1898)

SELIGMAN, EDWIN R. A.—

Mediæval Guilds of England. (Am. Econ. Assoc. Pub., 1887)

SHARP, THOMAS—

Dissertation on the Pageants or Dramatic Mysteries Anciently Performed at Coventry. (Coventry, 1825)

SCHELLING, FELIX E.—

Elizabethan Drama. [2 vols.] (Houghton, Mifflin, 1908) [Contains chapters on the Old Sacred Drama, the Morality, and the Earlier Secular Plays; also a concise bibliographical chapter which may be used as a working basis] — —The English Chronicle Play: A Study in the Popular Historical Literature Environing Shakespeare. (Macmillan, 1902) [This reference is given, since the Chronicle Play, as a type, like the Morality as a type, brings the development continuously from the *Trope* to the Elizabethan drama.]

SMITH, G. GREGORY—

The Transition Period. (Edinburgh, 1900) [Chap. vii—Dramatic Origins: The Drama in France; Chap. viii—The Drama in England and in Scotland; Chap. ix—The Drama in Germany.]

SMITH, TOULMIN—

English Gilds: The Original Ordinances. (London, 1870) [This is a collection of significant documents.]

STODDARD, FRANCIS H.—

References for Students of Miracle Plays and

Mysteries. (University of California. Library Bulletin. No. 8, 1887)

SYMONDS, JOHN ADDINGTON—

Shakespere's Predecessors in the English Drama. (London, 1884)

TEN BRINK, BERNHARD—

Geschichte der Englischen Literatur. [vol. ii.; tr., William Clarke Robinson.] (N. Y., 1889)

TISDEL, FREDERICK MONROE—

The Influence of Popular Customs on the Mystery Plays. (*Jour. Eng. and German Philol.*, vol. v, no. 3, pp. 323-340.) [Containing footnotes of bibliographical value.]

——Comedy in the Mystery Plays of England. [Harvard University Thesis, 1906]

WARD, A. W.—

History of English Dramatic Literature to the Death of Queen Anne. (London, 1899)

WRIGHT, THOMAS—

Early Mysteries, and other Latin Poems of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries. (London, 1838) [With an Introduction.]

### EDITIONS OF PLAYS.

ADAM. Palustre, L.—Adam, Mystère du XII<sup>e</sup> Siècle. (Paris, 1877)

CASTELL OF PERSEVERANCE. Pollard, A. W.—English Miracle Plays.

CHESTER MYSTERIES. Wright, Thomas—[ed.] (Shakespeare Society. Issued in 1853 as vol. i. of Supplement to Dodsley's Old Plays.)

COVENTRY CYCLE. Halliwell-Phillips, J. O.—[ed.]  
*Ludus Coventriæ*. (Shakespeare Society, 1841)

EVERYMAN. Farmer, John S.—Six Anonymous  
 Plays. First Series (c. 1510-1537) Everyman  
 [pp. 89-122, including woodcuts and notes].  
 (London: Printed privately for subscribers by  
 the Early English Drama Society, 1905; also  
 reproduced separately in "The Museum Dra-  
 matists, No. 3.")

Greg, W. W.—(Reprint from ed. by John  
 Skot, preserved at Britwell Court.)  
 [Materialien zur kunde des älteren Eng-  
 lischen Dramas.—Leipzig, 1904]

Hawkins, Thomas—Origin of the Eng-  
 lish Drama. [vol. i] (Oxford, 1773)

Hazlitt's Dodsley. [vol. i] (London, 1874)

Logeman, H.—Elckerlyc—Everyman, de  
 Vraag naar de prioriteit opnieuw onder-  
 zocht. (Université de Gand, Recueil de  
 travaux, 28 fascicule.) Gand. Vuylsteke,  
 1902.

Museum Dramatists. (Published for  
 Early English Drama Society. Lon-  
 don, 1904)

Pollard, A. W.—English Miracle Plays.

—Fifteenth Century Prose and Verse.  
 [An English Garner. Everyman, pp.  
 277-304.] (Westminster, 1903)

Roersch, A. — Elckerlijc — Everyman—  
 Homulus—Hekastus. (Archiv. für das  
 Studium der Neueren Sprachen und  
 Literaturen, cxiii, 1904, pp. 13-16)



Sidgwick, F.—Reprint. (London, 1902)

HROTSVITHA, THÉÂTRE DE—

Religieuse Allemande du X<sup>e</sup> Siècle (en Français)  
avec le Texte Latin Revu sur le Manuscrit de  
Munich. (Introduction et Notes.) Charles  
Magnin. [Paris, 1845]

INTERLUDE OF YOUTH. Hazlitt's Dodsley. [vol. ii]

LUSTY JUVENTUS. Hazlett's Dodsley. [vol. ii]

MARY MAGDALENE. Dr. Furnivall's ed. Digby Mys-  
teries.

Pollard, A. W.—English Miracle Plays.

MIRACLES DE NOTRE-DAME. MS. 2 vols. Bibl. Nat.  
819, 820.

PROPHÈTES DU CHRIST. Drama found in MS. Bibl.  
Nat. Fonds Latin, 1139. Consult also:

Coussemaker, A.—Drames Liturgiques. [No.  
2, p. 11]

Magnin.—Journal des Savants. (Feb.,  
1846)

Du Méril.—Origines Latines. [p. 179]

RÉSURRECTION, La. Monmerqué et Michel.—Théâ-  
tre Français au Moyen Âge. [pp. 10-20]  
(Paris, 1879)

ST. NICHOLAS. Monmerqué et Michel.—Théâtre Fr.  
au Moyen Âge. [pp. 158-207]

THÉOPHILE. Monmerqué et Michel.—Théâtre Fr.,  
etc. [pp. 136-156]

TOWNELEY MYSTERIES. Pollard, A. W. [ed.] [Early  
English Text Society.] (London, 1897)

YORK MYSTERIES. Smith, Lucy Toulmin. [ed.]  
[Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1885]











QTP Δ  
115  
wt-

PR Everyman.  
2411 Everyman, a morality play. Edited w  
E8 introduction, notes, and bibliography  
1908 Montrose J. Moses. New York, M. Kenne  
[c1908]  
161p. 8 plates. 19cm.

Bibliography: p. 148-161.

1. Moralities, English. I. Moses, M  
Jonas, 1878-

CCSC/mmb

335275

